

Transubstantiation Defended;

5

And Prov'd from

SCRIPTURE:
IN

ANSWER

TO

THE FIRST PART

OF A

TREATISE,

INTITLED,

A Discourse against Transubstantiation.

The First Part.

S. Ignatius Ep. ad Smyrnaeos.

Εὐχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχουσαι διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σὰρκὰ εἶναι τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθῆσαν, ἣν τῇ χερσὶ τοῦ πατρὸς ἤγειρεν: Οἱ ἔν ἀντιλέγοντες τῇ δαρεῇ τοῦ θεοῦ συζηῖντες ἀποθνήσκουσιν.

They abstain from our Communion, because they do not confess the Eucharist to be the Flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that very Flesh which suffer'd for our sins, which the Father of his bounty raised again: Those therefore which contradict this free gift of God, die scrupulously Questioning the matter amongst themselves.

Publish'd with allowance.

L O N D O N,

Printed by *Henry Hills*, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty for His Household and Chappel. 1687.

Case

C

8231

.8775

The Principal Contents of the Introduction.

1. Reasons why the Discourse against Transubstantiation lay so long unanswer'd.
2. The Real or Essential Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, shew'd to be the Doctrin of the English Church.
3. How the Catholic Church necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation from our Saviours words understood in a proper Sense.
4. The Pretended Demonstration to the contrary from the Sense of the Word *This*, in those Words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, so highly boasted of in the *Expostulatory Letter to Mr. Sclater of Putney*, shew'd to be a mere Illusion.

A N
INTRODUCTION
To the ensuing
ANSVVER.

Some have wondred, whilst others Triumph't,
and a late Writer particularly hath vainly
boasted, in a certain * Letter to a Friend, that * Publisht at
Two great Doctōrs of the English Church, Dublin.
had baffled their Adversaries of Rome even to the
silencing of that Party, and all this was because the
Discourse against Transubstantiation lay so long un-
answer'd. The best account, that I can give of the so
long silence, is, that the more considerate knew, that
the said Discourse contained no new matter, but only
what had been very often objected against us since the
Pretended Reformation of the English Church, and
as often fully Answered, as also, that there have been
(a) two large Volumes Written by a Learned Catho-
lic Author, and (b) cited by the Discourser him-
self, wherein the Objections against Transubstantia-
tion are put much further than this late Discourse
urges them, and all clear'd beyond the Power of any
solid Answer; and we find none for many Years last
past

(a) Mr. Arnolds
two last Vo-
lums concer-
ning the Per-
petuity of the
Faith, &c.

(b) Pa. 42. Of
the Discourse
against Tran-
substantiation,

An Introduction.

past so much as offer'd at against the said Treatises, nor yet to a more compendious one Entitled, A Rational Discourse concerning Transubstantiation Publish'd 1676. In which the chief Objections repeated since by the Discourser are fully clear'd. Moreover, the Doctrin of the English Church concerning the Real Presence being no less vigorously attack'd by the late Discourser, than that of the Roman Catholic, it was thought more proper, that some of them should have first return'd an Answer to it, because they had the greater Reason to resent the injury done them, since a wound from a pretended Friend is more grievous than from a profest Adversary.

Indeed, I would not have the Genuin Sons of the English Church to think, that we differ so much with them in this Point, as some by Misrepresenting the thing, would make us to do, seeing that they do acknowledge with Bishop Andrews, præsentiam non minus quam nos veram; no less True Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, than we do, and I am sure that is True enough; our difference with them, (who deny Consubstantiation, as is manifest from their Writings,) being only about the not admitting the Word Transubstantiation, whereas they have so long freely acknowledged the thing. For if the Body of Christ be Really present in the Sacrament, and not with the substance of Bread, it must be there without it, under the External Species only of Bread, and consequently such a change of substance as the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation, must certainly be made; and there can be no other sense given of that Real Presence which hath been received in their Church.

Now

An Introduction.

*Now, that the Real Presence of Christs Body, together with it's Vertue and Efficacy, is the acknowledged Belief of the Greatest and most Learned Persons of the English Communion is * certain, notwithstanding the weak endeavor of an imperfect Answerer to the Animadversions upon the Alterations of their Rubrick lately Publisht, to shew the contrary. Which that it may the more plainly appear, I shall add one Observation made by a Famed Doctor of their Church, which will be the more Authentick, because it was drawn from their Records.*

* *vid.* Two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our Blessed Saviour in the Eucharist, &c. c. 2. of the first Discourse. Printed at Oxford, An 1657.

It was proposed, saith this * Doctor, to have the Communion Book, *viz.* That put forth in the beginning of Queen Elizabeths Reign, so contriv'd, that it might not exclude the Belief of the Corporal Presence: (I doubt not, but they meant after a Spiritual manner, as Catholics do suitably to St. Paul who uses the words Spiritual Body to signifie a Real Body existing after a Spiritual manner) For the chief Design of the Queens Council was to unite the Nation in one Faith, and the Greater part of the Nation continued to believe such a Presence; (which however seems to have been determin'd against in their former Articles and Rubrick.) Thereupon, the Rubrick that explain'd the reason for kneeling at the Sacrament, that thereby no Adoration is intended to any Corporal Presence of Christs Natural Flesh and Blood, because that is only in Heaven, which had been in King Edwards Liturgy, is left out — * And in the Article about the Lords Supper the Refutation of the Corporal Presence was by Common consent left out. — And in the next Convocation the Articles were subscribed with.

* Dr. Burnet in his History of the Reformation Part 2. p. 390. Of the Reign of Qu. Elizabeth. See also Dr. Heylins Cyprianus Anglicus, p. 22. in the Introduction.

* Part 2. of Hist. Reform. p. 405.

An Introduction.

without them, of which, *he tells us*, he had seen the Original. Now, *whatsoever this Doctor (whose usual Practice it hath been, like the Snake in the Fable, to bite and betray those that have cherisht him) pretends to know of a Secret concerning this matter, (for which he doth not bring the least proof or Authority, whereas he had seen the Original to be an evidence of what he had before said,) yet for my part I have more Deference for the English Church, than to believe that the Real Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament was, after so much consideration about the matter, (now behold the secret comes out,) left as a speculative Opinion, as he saith, and not determin'd, but every Man left to the freedom of his own mind, because an expresse Definition against the Real Presence might drive from the Church many who were still of that perswasion. For then those studiously alter'd Articles and Rubrick had only been made as a Trap to draw Men into Idolatry, and keep them in it, if you will believe some of the great Modern Writers who live in Communion, at present, with the English Church, and yet deny that Real Presence, which was both in Queen Elizabeths time, and ever since believed in that Church, and tax those with Idolatry who Worship Christ thus present. Therefore we have good Reason to allow, what he tells us afterwards, that some (we are sure that many of the most Learned amongst them) have since truly inferr'd, that the Chief Pastors of the Church did then disapprove of the Definition made in King Edwards time, and that they were for a Real Presence.*

*And of this we can make no doubt, when we peruse the Writings of those Pastors, who succeeding them till
this*

An Introduction.

*this very time, have given so full an account of their Faith in this weighty instance, and yet have past uncensur'd, nay, have been of greatest esteem in their Church. And how indeed can we imagin, that Men of the least sincerity would leave an Article of infinite concern to Mens Immortal Souls in so undeterminat a Sense, that Christians might believe, which they pleas'd, either that Christs Body was thus Really present in the Sacrament, which, if it were not, they incurr'd the guilt of gross Idolatry, or that it was not so, which if Really it was, they were guilty of Infidelity, in not believing Our Lord upon his Word; and a breach of the first Commandment, in not Worshipping the second Person in the Trinity, presenting himself to us in this Sacrament; according to that saying, of the Great * St. Augústin concerning this matter; Peccamus * In Psal. 98. non adorando, We sin in not Worshipping? Such an Equivocation as this, in an Assembly of Christian Pastors, upon the proposál of so great a Point, must needs have been of far more dangerous consequence to Christians, than the Ambiguous Answers of the Delphic Oracle, were to the Heathen World. Thus far then the business is clear'd, that the Real, and not Virtual Presence only of Christs Body in the Sacrament, was the Doctrin of the English Church; for what some Men amongst them of great Latitude in Belief have maintain'd to the contrary, doth not prejudice the truth, which the more sound of that Communion have generally asserted.*

And notwithstanding, that their Late Clergy in the Year, 1661. in compliance to the Dissenting Party, by the chief management of the late Lord Shaftsbury's Politic Spirit, were induced after hard solliciting

An Introduction.

to receive an Additional Declaration, (tho' not Printed in their Rubrick Letter,) at the end of their Communion Service, yet, since they would not by any means be brought to receive the former Declaration of King Edward the Sixth's time, without the change of those words [It is here declared that no Adoration is here intended or ought to be done unto any Real and Essential Presence of Christs Natural Flesh and Blood] into these which follow [It is here declared, that no Adoration is here intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there Bodily Received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christs Natural Flesh and Blood] the words Real and Essential, as you see, being changed into, Corporal; this cannot but reasonably be imagin'd to be done out of Caution to the Present Church, her maintaining still a Real and Essential Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament; whereas those in the latter time of King Edward seem to have denied it. Moreover, tho' it be said in this last Declaration, that the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very Natural Substances, and therefore may not be Adored, yet if by Natural Substances or Essences here is no more meant, (as the words may very well be understood, and are shewn by Catholics to be understood in the Authorities of Theodoret, and Gelasius,) than the external and sensible Essences, or properties of Bread and Wine, and not the internal Substance, or Essence, this Declaration will not be repugnant, either to the Real Presence or to Transubstantiation, and the Adoration will be terminated neither on the Internal or External Essences of Bread and Wine, but upon Christ the only begotten Son of God, Really Present

An Introduction.

*sent in the Blessed Sacrament, which the * Council* * Can. 6. de |
Eucharistia in
sancto Eucharis-
tiae Sacramento
of Trent it self hath declared to be the Sense of the
Catholic Church as to the Point of Adoration.

Again, if the last part of this Declaration, where- Christum uni-
genitum Dei
filium cultu La-
trie adorandum;
in it is said, that the Natural Body and Blood of
Christ are in Heaven and not here; it being a-
gainst the Truth of Christs Natural Body to be at
one time in more places than one, be yet urg'd,
to prove, that the above mention'd Real Presence
of Christs Body in the Eucharist is not at present the
Doctrin of the English Church. I answer, that where-
as it is there said, that the Natural Body and Blood
of Christ are in Heaven, and not here, meaning
in the Sacrament; if by Natural Body be there un-
derstood Christs Body, according to the Natural man-
ner of a Bodies being present, and according to which,
tho' in a glorified state, it actually exists in Heaven,
we do not say, that the Body of Christ is here in this
Sacrament in that natural manner, any more than the
Doctors of the English Communion; but if no more
be mean't by the words, Natural Body, but the very
true and (as we may call it) Essential Body of Christ,
tho' present in a supernatural manner, proper to the
Sacrament, it is a very bold assertion to say absolutely,
that it is against the Truth of it to be so, or that this
cannot possibly be true, since we know so little to what
the Omnipotence of God, which could convey this very
Body into the Room, where the Disciples were, the
Doors being fast shut, can extend it self, and yet the Body
be the very same Body in verity of Nature which is
in Heaven; the Presence of which in the Sacrament
*a late Eminent * Author of the English Church (a) suf-*
ficiently intimates, that some (he might have said

* In a Trea-
tise intitl'd
several Con-
ferences. &c.
(a) Pag. 65.

a

very

An Introduction.

very many) of their Divines have maintain'd; notwithstanding the vain endeavors, which the Answerer to the Treatise, Printed at Oxford, to shew the sentiment of the Church of England Divines in this Point, has us'd to wrest them to another Sense: For after having told us his own Opinion, viz. that all which the Doctrin of his Church (meaning the Church of England) implies, is only a Real Presence of Christ's Invisible Power and Grace, so in and with the Elements, as by the Faithful receiving of them, to convey Spiritual and Real Effects to the Souls of Men, he subjoyns, if any one yet thinks, that some at least of our Divines have gone farther than this, i. e. do seem to speak of the Presence of the very same Body which is in Heaven, let them know,

* See their 28 Art. of Religion which confirms the Body of Christ to be given, taken and eaten in the Supper after an Heavenly and Spiritual manner, and Catech. where it is said, the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received. The forecited Author doth not well defend this Doctrin.

*says he, it is the * Doctrin of our Church I am to defend, and not of every particular Divine in it. Now altho' by those many terms, of every particular Divine, and seeming to speak, he endeavors what he can both to diminish the number, and their clear acknowledgment of the Presence of the same Body in the Sacrament which is in Heaven, yet he could not but know that the Asserters of it were very many, and still are, even since the Declaration, and such as may be presumed to know the meaning of it, as cunningly worded as it is, as well, if not better than himself; and for this, besides what I have had by particular converse with divers, I will appeal to the sincerity of those who have heard the Determinations which have been made by their Learned Professors in the Publick Schools of both their Universities, ever since this last Declaration was receiv'd, whether they are not fully satisfied, that they have been much more Positive for a Real Presence*

An Introduction.

sence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, in a further Sense than the abovementioned Author, and others in their Late Discourses against Transubstantiation declare themselves to be. And I have the rather given the Sense before expressed of the last clause of their new Declaration, which indeed is the only one it can truly bear, because the Catholic Church Authoriseth it in the * Council of Trent, by Declaring there, that these two things are not inconsistent, viz. that Our Saviour according to his Natural way of Existing, should sit at the Right hand of his Father in Heaven, and that he should be in the substance Present to us Sacramentally, by that manner of Existence; which altho' it can scarcely be expressed in words, yet our mind enlightened by Faith can be brought to conceive, that it is possible with God.

* Sess. 13.
C. 1. Neque enim hæc inter se pugnant, juxta modum existendi naturalem Salvatorem nostrum in cælis assidere ad dextram Patris & nobis substantiâ suâ adesse præsentem sacramentaliter, eâ exi-

stendi ratione; quam eisdem verbis exprimere vix possumus, possibilem tamen esse Deo cogitatione per fidem illustratâ assequi possumus.

I hope therefore, that Christian Charity may in time put a happy end to the tedious Disputes, which have been so long held about the Blessed Sacrament; that so the Sacred Symbols of Peace and Unity may no longer be made the Subject of Contention. Especially when we consider, that tho', when the * strange Opinion, of there being only some certain Vertue of Christs Body in the Sacrament, and not that very Body it

* Paschasius Epist. ad Frudegard —
Miror quid volunt quidem

nunc dicere, non in re esse veritatem carnis Christi, vel Sanguinis; sed in Sacramento virtutem quandam carnis & non carnem. — concerning which Real Presence it is said: Usque ad præsens nemo deerrasse legitur, nisi qui de Christo erraverunt, and futher — Quamvis ex hoc quidam de ignorantia errent; nemo tamen est adhuc in aperto, qui hoc ita esse contradicat, quod totus orbis credit & confitetur.

An Introduction.

self *was first* privately held, about eight hundred and eighteen Years after our Saviours time, by some Persons that erred through ignorance, yet they were *asham'd* publickly to contradict, as some in this last Age have done, that Real Presence which the whole Christian World believ'd and confest, and concerning which none had ever before erred in the Church, but those who had erred concerning Christ himself. Likewise, that altho' the fourth Great Council of Lateran, one of the Greatest which ever was held in the Christian World, that they might put an end to the contentions then arisen, and maintain Christian verity, and peace amongst the Faithful, did in declaring the Faith of the Church concerning the Blessed Sacrament make use of the word * Transubstantiated, to express precisely that Great and Supernatural change therein made, which the Catholic Church had in all precedent Ages even from Christs time believed, as being necessarily deduced from our Saviours words, and express'd by the Primitive Fathers in several other terms signifying the same thing; yet the Catholic Church thought it not necessary to determin any thing concerning those nicer speculations about the modes of this wonderful change, which have exercised the more subtle Wits, even before the time of the Lateran Council and ever since.

* De Christo loquens Concilium, cujus corpus & sanguis in Sacramento altaris, sub speciebus panis & vini veraciter continentur, Transubstantiatis pane in Corpus, & vino in sanguinem, potestate Divina. Concil. Lateranense 4.

Generale, Anno

Christi 1215. vid. in Binnio. c. 1. p. 806.

And of this excellent moderation used by the Catholic Church we have a clear evidence from the proceedings of the Council of Trent in reference to this matter

An Introduction.

matter which, as * Padre Paul himself, notwithstanding he was no great friend to Catholics in his *Historical Relations of the Proceedings of this Council*, relates, determin'd to use so very few, and those Universal terms in the Article of the Blessed Sacrament, as might satisfy both Parties, viz. the Scotists and Thomists, and be fitly accommodated to the Sense of each of them; but not so as to establish their distinct private speculations. (a) Cardinal Pallavicino likewise tells us, speaking concerning the circumspection of the Tridentin Fathers, that they would have nothing determin'd concerning the *modus* or manner of the Sacramental Presence of Christ. So far were they from prejudicing either of the Theological Classes, or from offering to declare those things as Articles of Faith which were not the Revelations of God, but the speculations of Men. So that, if we can agree, that this great supernatural change is made in the Sacrament, without the admission of which those of the English Church can never prove, that Presence of Christs Body in the Holy Eucharist, which they acknowledge to be (b) no less true than we do, they will be yet left at liberty, and need not determin rashly concerning the manner of it, nor so much as anxiously to inquire into this Point.

For indeed Transubstantiation is a great mystery of Christian Religion, so is the Doctrine of the Trinity, so is the Incarnation of our Lord, to which the Primitive Fathers do so often compare the su-

* *Historia concil. Trident. Francofurti Edit. 1521. lib. 4. pa. 367. In Congregatione mox Generali Statutum, in dogmate conficiendo verbis uti quam paucissimis, ilque adeo universalibus, ut utriusque, viz. Scoti. & Thomæ Sectatoribus, queant satisfacere, & ad utriusque partis sensum commodè aptari.*

(a) *In parte seconda del Istoria del Concilio di Trento l. 12. cap. primo.*

Speaking of the Definitions of the Council, hath these words:

Le quali tutte sono così circospette che talora paiono in cercar forme di parole lontane da ogni sembianza di pregiudicio a veruna delle Classi Teologiche.

cbe. E perciò niente si volle determinare, intorno al modo della presenza sacramentale di Cristo. (b) *Præsentiam credimus nec minus quam vos veram, de modo præsentia nihil temerè definimus; addo, nec anxie inquiramus.* Bishop Andrews, Resp. ad Apoll. Bell. G. 1. P. 11.

pernatural

An Introduction.

pernatural change made in the Sacrament; so is the Resurrection of our Bodies; yet these Articles of Christian Faith are to be believed upon the Authority of the Revealer, and not too curiously to be pried into.

I shall insist only upon the Resurrection at present, to shew how little ground they have to believe this, upon the account of natural Reason, who reject the belief of Transubstantiation, by Vertue of which we receive the Instrument and pledge of our Resurrection Christs Real Body in the Sacrament: Both these indeed may seem contrary to Reason, before enlightened by Faith: For how can that convince us, that the same Body which dies shall rise again; since some that eat Mans Flesh in the extremity of Famine, or, as the Cannibals, out of luxury, have the substance of the Bodies, that they eat, converted into the substance of their own Bodies by the way of nourishment: And several other ways there be, by which the reduced parts of our Dead Bodies are changed into the substance of other Human Bodies, even so, that the same Bodies may be claimed by many at the Resurrection? Notwithstanding we believe, that we shall rise with the same Bodies we had, whilst living. Dim sighted Reason will ask, how this can be, since it is against the Nature of a Body to be in two places at the same time? Yet Nature and experience prepare us for the belief of the Resurrection, which seems to be against Nature, by the example of those things, which are obvious to Sense. Seed, as the Apostle instanceth, is cast into the ground, it corrupts, and yet riseth again, for God giveth it a Body, and to every Seed it's own Body. So to dispose us to the belief of the supernatural change made in the Sacrament, nothing is more familiar than Natural Transubstantiation,

1 Cor. 15. 38.

An Introduction.

*Substantiation, for our life is sustained by a dayly change of the substance of other Creatures into that of our Bodies ; we should soon die without this : Nay we cannot breath , but the substance of our Bodies is converted into Air ; and he that denies this Transubstantiation, confutes himself while he speaks. Thus Bread also was dayly Transubstantiated into our Lords Body , whilst he fed upon it here on Earth. All which may dispose us to believe, that the Bread in the Sacramental Consecration, as * Gregory Nyssen teacheth us, passeth into the Body of Christ the Word, not indeed as it did by the way of manducation, and nourishment , but being suddainly transform'd into the Body of the Word, as is said by the Word, This is my Body.*

And if our curious Inquirers shall further ask ; how this can be, since the accidents or outward species of Bread still remain ? I desire them to resolve these Questions : How a thousand species can be reflected from the same Glas at once, to a thousand Eyes at the same time ? How the same Glas being whole, transmits one intire species, and yet broken into many small pieces, every piece reflects the same whole and intire species, there being all the while but one subject, and what that subject is wherein these species do subsist ? Or let them but give a true account of the nature of any small Particle of that matter, which composeth the Universe, before they pry too far into the secrets of Divine and supernatural Mysteries, and think that God can do nothing, but in such a manner as they can comprehend.

** Ut enim illic
verbi Dei gratia
sanctum efficit
illud corpus cu-
jus firmamen-
tum ex pane
constabat, &
ipsum etiam
quodammodo
panis erat, sic
etiam hic panis,
ut ait Apostolus,
per verbum Dei
& orationem
Sanctificatur,
non quia come-
ditur eo progre-
diens ut verbi
corpus evadat,
sed statim per
verbum in cor-
pus mutatur,
(περὶ τὸ σῶ-
μα τῷ λόγῳ
μεταποιε-
μένον) ut dictum
est à verbo, hoc*

est corpus meum. Catechet. Orat. c. 37.

Therefore

An Introduction.

Therefore our Adversaries had good reason to say, speaking concerning the Objections against the Trinity, Incarnation and the Resurrection with identity of

(*) Dr. Taylor
of the Real
Presence.
pa. 2; 7.

(b) *Idem* Li-
berty of Pro-
phesying.
§. 20. n. 16.

(c) Dr. Stilling-
fleet Rat. ac-
count, p. 117.
and 565.

(d) Bishop
Forbes p. 395.
*Vid. etiam con-
fessionem Theo-
logorum, Wir-
temberg. in
Confess. A.
1552.*

Bodies, (a) That if there were as plain Revelation of Transubstantiation, as of those, then this Argument were good; and that if it were possible to bring a thousand more Arguments against Transubstantiation, yet that we are to believe the Revelation in despite of them all: *Again, That*

(b) Those who believe the Trinity in all those Niceties of Explications which are in the Schools, and which now a days pass for the Doctrine of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the principles of natural and supernatural Philosophy, as can be imagin'd to be in the Point of Transubstantiation. *And do not therefore insist up-*

on the Point (c) how far Reason is to be submitted to Divine Authority, in case of certainty, that there is a Divine Revelation for what they are to believe. *And, (d) that there are things, haud pauca,* not few in number, which we all believe, that, if human Reason be consulted, do not seem less impossible, and less manifestly contradictory than Transubstantiation it self.

Now, that the words of our Lord, This is my Body, being understood in a proper Sense, as in the ensuing Answer is prov'd they ought to be, do necessarily infer Transubstantiation, is manifest. Because, as is allowed by all, that was Bread which our Lord took into his hands, before he spoke those Words; there must therefore a Change be made, otherwise it could not Really become Christs Body, nor that which he gave his Disciples, be in a proper Sense so called.

And

An Introduction.

And the Accidents or sensible species still remaining as before, the change must be made in the substance.

*This is what the * Tridentine Council infers in these Words: Because Christ our Redeemer did affirm, that truly to be his Body which he offer'd, under the species of Bread, therefore, it was ever Believed in the Church of God, which also the Holy Synod now again Declares, that by the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Conversion made of the whole substance of Bread into the substance of the Body of our Lord Christ, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood, which Conversion is, by the Holy Catholic Church fitly and properly called Transubstantiation.*

** Sess. 13. de Euchar. c. 4. Quoniam autem Christus Redemptor noster, corpus suum id, quod sub specie panis offerebat verè esse dixit, ideo persuasum semper in Ecclesia Dei fuit, idque nunc sancta hæc Synodus declarat, per Consecrationem Panis & Vini conver-*

sionem fieri totius substantiæ panis in substantiam Corporis Christi Domini nostri, & totius substantiæ vini in substantiam sanguinis ejus, quæ Conversio convenienter & propriè à Sancta Catholica Ecclesia Transubstantiatio est appellata.

The foregoing Inference will evidently appear to be true, if we consider the proper and genuin Sense of every particular Word in that Proposition of our Lord, This is my Body.

*This, here in its true and * proper Sense, signifies * See also some Thing, Essence, Substance, or Object in general, p. 26, 27. of the Answer, under such an appearance as was Demonstrated to Sense. For if by the word, This, were express'd the whole Nature of the Predicate in such a Proposition, e. g. as This is Bread, or This is my Body, then the Proposition would be purely Identical, or Tautological; for it would be no more than if one should say, This Bread is Bread, or This my Body is my Body: Whereas it is the property of the Attribute to extend, and fully to determin the Idea of the Subject, by adding*

An Introduction.

ding clearness to it. And we must remember, that the English word, This, is exprest by τῆτο in the Original Greek here, as also in most other Languages, not by ἄτος in the Masculine Gender, so as to agree with ἄτος Bread. Now tho' there be no distinction as to the Gender in the English word, This, Yet τῆτο ἄτος, This Bread, as our Adversaries would have here meant, is false Grammar.

In like manner the Word, Is, hath here it's proper Sense; not as it is used sometimes, for Signifies. The Word My can have Relation to no other Person but our Lord, who spoke it; nor consequently to any other Body, but his own, truly so, as to it's Substance, and therefore truly exprest by the Word, Body; that, which was before Bread, at the beginning of the Enunciation, This is my Body, being now made to be his Body at its Conclusion, because in Practical Propositions as this is, with God to say, and to do, are the same thing; and thus you see, what is meant by each word in the Proposition, This is my Body, as explicated by Catholics, tho' you do not believe the Mystery.

* See *Verres Vindicati*, in an Expostulatory Letter to Mr. Sclater of Putney, pa. 57.

Let us now observe, what a Late * Expostulator hath said against this Explication. He undertakes to prove, that the Words, **This is my Body**, cannot be taken in a literal, (*I conceive he means proper, in opposition to Figurative*) Sense, which he supposes his Enemies themselves of our Party will grant, if he proves that the, **This**, here mentioned is Bread; which he thus undertakes to do.

That, saith he, which our Saviour took into his Hands, (when he was about the Institution) was

An Introduction.

was Bread; that which he blessed was the same thing that he had taken into his hands; that which he brake was the same thing that he had blessed; that which he gave them when he said it was his Body, was that which he had broken; But that which he broke, which he blessed, which he took into his hands was Bread: Therefore it was Bread, which he gave his Disciples, and by **This**, is meant **This Bread**.

This * Induction, saith the Expostulator, is so fair and so clear, that I am sure you cannot evade it.

But what, Sir, if after all your mighty boasting, This prove to be neither a fair Induction, nor any Argument at all, but a mere Fallacy or Illusion proceeding from what Logicians call, Ignoratio Elenchi, Ignorance of Argument or proof? And just such a one as This would be, if proposed to you: That which the Butcher exposed to Sale was raw Flesh; that which you bought was the same thing, that the Butcher exposed to Sale; that which you Eat was the same thing that you bought; But that which you bought, which the Butcher expos'd to Sale was raw Flesh, therefore you Eat raw Flesh. The Kitchen-Boy will tell you where the Fallacy lies, and help you out at a dead lift.

But to make the matter yet more plain, I shall give you some other instances in your way of Sophistry, which the most ignorant at the first hearing will discover to be Fallacies. That which the Servants at the Marriage of Cana in Galilee, took from the Fountain, was Water; that which they poured into the Water-pots was the same, that they took from the Fountain; that which the Guests drank was the same, that the Servants put into the Water-pots; But that which

* Observe that this is no Induction but rather a Sorites, altho' the Author knew not how to put the Subject and Predicate in their right places. See any Common Logic.

An Introduction.

the Servants took from the Fountain, which they poured into the Pots was Water; therefore it was Water which the Guests drank. Or your Argument may in a shorter way be turn'd against you thus: That which Christ took into his hands, he gave: But, that which he took into his hands was not Sacramental Bread, nor virtually Christs Body, therefore that which he gave was not Sacramental Bread, nor virtually Christs Body.

And now repeating your Argument truly, tho' without all your heap of words, I shall expose it's Fallacy plainly. That, you say, which Christ took, &c. he gave; but he took Bread; therefore he gave Bread. I distinguish the Major. That he took, he gave; unchanged or in the same manner he took it, I deny: What he took, he gave, changed and made his Body I grant, and so agreeing he took Bread, I deny your Consequence. Look into your Logic again, observe it well, and you will find, that to make a Proposition contradictory to ours, viz. That, that which Christ gave was his Real Body, you must observe the Rules of your Master Aristotle, so as to speak, de eodem modo, & eodem tempore, which you have not here known how to do. Yet you for all this, would be esteemed the Great Champion for the Protestant cause, and boast, that this your matter and Argument is so Demonstrative, that you cannot but stand amazed that Men, who pretend to reason, can refuse it.

*This pretended Demonstration might be much more exposed, had I leasure, whilst I am discoursing upon so serious a point, to insist upon trifles. Neither would the * Remarks, which he afterwards makes, help him in the least; For tho' our Saviour did say, according to St. Luke and St. Paul, This Cup is the New*

* See Expo-
sulatory Letter,
pa. 58.

An Introduction.

*New Testament in my Blood, yet this passage doth not fully determin, that, by This is my Body is meant This Bread is my Body : For the word, This, in the Proposition, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood ; being joyned with the word Cup, by a known Figure, to signifie in a General way, what is contained in the Cup, only makes the Proposition to Signifie, That, which is contained in the Cup is the New Testament in my Blood ; which in the Evangelists St. Matthew and St. Mark, is exprest by these words, This is my Blood of the New Testament ; so that the word This still, altho' joyned to Cup, hath no other kind of signification than it hath in the Words, This is my Body, as I have before explained them : Also if it had the Sense which the Author of the Expostulatory Letter would give it, then the meaning would be, This Wine is the New Testament in my Blood, or as according to St. Matthew and St. Mark, This Wine is my Blood of the New Testament, which words in the Sense that our Adversaries put upon them, would in those circumstances, wherein they were spoken, have been contrary to the Rules of Human Discourse, suitably to what is shew'd in the ensuing * Answer concerning the Words, This is my Body, taken in their Sense.*

The Adversary indeed, in This Expostulatory Letter, insolently Triumphs, because he hath found out some mistakes in Translating, &c. But his Answer to the Fathers Authorities which have been so often truly cited as an undeniable Evidence against his Party, will easily be shew'd to be unsatisfactory, (when we come to their proper place) and he so slightly attacks, as you have seen, our main Evidence
the

An Introduction.

* *Ipe panis & vinum transmutantur in corpus & sanguinem Dei. Nec quicquam nobis amplius perspectum & exploratum est quam quod verbum Dei verum est & efficax,* the * proper Sense of our Lords words as hardly to bring the face of an Argument against it : So we Read that a Humorsom (a) Emperor, when he came to invade Great Britain, only gather'd Cockles, and yet for this he demanded Triumph in a Letter to his Senators, thinking his Shell-spoils worthy Offerings for the Capitol.

atque omnipotens. S. Johan. Damascen. lib. 3. Orthodox. fidei. c. 14.

(a) Caligula.

We have one Request now to make to those who oppose the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, That because it is necessary for an Answerer to know distinctly what the Persons mean to whom he is to make an Answer, they would deal sincerely with us ; and since we have told them in what Sense every word in the Proposition This is my Body is taken by us, and how the Catholic Church doth necessarily infer Transubstantiation from them, they would now deal as candidly with us, and tell us, as plainly, as we have done, how they understand each of these words. I have reason to intreat this favor of them, because altho' they seem sometimes to maintain only a Vertual not Real Prefence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, which Opinion of theirs I have chiefly opposed in the Ensuing Answer ; yet at other-times they * (and even the Discourser himself) readily acknowledge a Great Supernatural change to be made by the Divine Benediction, and the Author of the * Expostulatory Letter hath a Reserv'd Distinction, of Christs Natural and Spiritual Flesh and Blood, seeming to allow that Christ hath a Spiritual Body in the Sacrament : We know not but that he intends the same, which the Learned Author of a

Brief

* See p. 11.
In the Discourse against Transubstantiation, Edit. Londini, 684.
* Pag. 102.

An Introduction.

Brief Discourse of the Real Presence *hath lately given us* of two *Bodies of Christ*, the one Natural in which he was Crucified, the other Spiritual belonging to him, as he is the Eternal Logos, in whom is the *Zōn*, Life or Spirit, which goes along with the Divine Body of this Life or Spirit of Christ, and consequently is rightly call'd his Body. *For this, he grounds himself upon* that earnest lofty and sublime Discourse (*as he calls it*) of our Saviour *in the 6th. Chapter of St. John*, confessing ingenuously, that it seems to him incredible, that under so lofty, mysterious a style, and earnest asseverations of what he affirms, tho' to the scandal both of the Jews, and his own Disciples, there should not be couched some most weighty and profound Truth concerning some Real Flesh and Blood of his, touching which this vehement and sublime Discourse is framed. *pa. 40. And then again, pa. 42. and 43.* It is plain, *says he*, that our Saviours Discourse in that Chapter, has for its Object or Subject, not the manner or way of receiving his Body and Blood, as if meant of that very Body and Blood on the Cross, to be receiv'd in a Spiritual manner, which Interpreters several of them (*meaning of the Reformers*) drive at, and which he thinks would be a very dilute and frigid Sense of such high and fervid asseverations of our Saviour; but the Object of his Discourse, *says he*, is his very Flesh and Blood it self, to be taken (as the Fish and Loaves were wherewith he lately fed them;) or it is himself in reference to his Flesh and Blood, which belongs to him as he is the Eternal Logos. *Thus evidently did our Saviour seem to this Learned Man*, to speak all along to the very end of his Discourse, of a Really Eating his Flesh and Drinking his Blood; and not of the manner of Eating, as if it never came nigh them, but only they thought of Flesh and Blood, God knows how far distant from them, and so Eat the human Flesh of Christ by meer thinking of it, and Drank his Blood after the same imaginary manner. *Thus to avoid the Catholic Tenent of Transubstantiation (which he could bear no more than the Jews) and yet verifie the Words of Christs Bodies being receiv'd verily and indeed, and such other Expressions found in the Catechism and Homelies of the Church*

A Brief Discourse of the Real Presence, Printed 1686. and Licenc'd by Guil. Needham Archiep. Cant. & Sac. Domest.

An Introduction.

Church of England (which he thought himself bound to maintain) he was driven to distinguish a double Body of Christ, the one Human and Natural, the other Spiritual and Divine, but both Real, as has been said before. Good God, what Chimera's will not a mind preoccupied with Error, frame to it self rather than submit to the Truth!

Luther indeed tells us of about ten Opinions of the Sacramentarians in his time; and a Book was Publisht in the Year, 1527, in which were reckon'd no less than 200 several Expositions of the Sense of these words; Hoc est Corpus meum; This is my Body. What we would gladly know of our Adversaries with whom we have now to deal, is, which of these (now two hundred and one) Opinions, it is that they maintain, or whether they have any other yet in Store (for Error hath no End) different from all these. For surely after all, they must be forc'd to allow, that there is but one True Sense of our Saviours Words, viz. either that it is his very true Substantial Body, which is taken and received, or a figure only, what vertue soever they please to assign to it. If the former, they fall in with the Catholics, or * Dr. Moors Tenet; if the latter, what Vertue soever they assign to a Figure, it is not the Real Body, nor the Body Really Present. Let them speak plain, that the World may understand them: The Faithful are not to be deluded with Ambiguities in a Point of so great concern to their Immortal Souls.

* viz. The Author of the Brief Discourse, &c. cited *supra*.

Reader, be pleas'd to observe concerning the manner and Method of the Ensuing *Treatise* and *Answer*, that the *Discourse against Transubstantiation* is faithfully here reprinted Section by Section, and a Reply made to the Sections in their Order. Also, that because the Discourser against Transubstantiation would delude unwary Christians by making them believe, that Catholics have no proof for this Doctrin from Scripture, this first Part which is chiefly concerning Scripture Authority is publisht by it self, to be consider'd distinctly; to which in convenient time, the Second Part is to be added.

Some ERRATA'S to be Corrected.

Pag. 18. in Marg. for *Preface* read *Introduction*. p. 27. last line read *under the Species*
 p. 42. in the Hebrew Citation, read **וְהָיָה** bis p. 60. read *Relicks*. Observe that in the Marginal Notes, p. 43. 56, 58, 63. the word, *infra*, hath relation to the Second Part of the Answer, which is not yet Publish'd.

Transub

Transubstantiation DEFENDED:

In Answer to a
Treatise, Intituled, A Discourse
against Transubstantiation.

DISCOURSE.

Concerning the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, one of the two great positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, there are two main Points of difference between Us and the Church of Rome. One, about the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; in which they think, but are not certain, that they have the Scripture and the words of our Saviour on their side: The other, about the administration of this Sacrament to the People, in both kinds; in which we are sure that we have the Scripture and our Saviour's Institution on our side; and that so plainly, that our Adversaries themselves do not deny it.

A N S W E R.

C Concerning the Sacrament of Union, the Lord's Supper; which is the chief of those several positive Institutions of Religion which Christ hath Ordained in his Church, there are many great differences

Our Adversary doth not rightly State the Point.

B

Transubstantiation Defended.

ences even between Protestants themselves ; it is no wonder therefore if there are as many between Protestants and Catholics : Of these the Author gives two instances , the one about the Doctrine of Transubstantiation , the other about the Administration of this Sacrament to the People in both kinds : As for that of Transubstantiation, he would have done well to have told us, in what supposition he means to take the Word in his Discourse. If he suppose the True, Real and Substantial Presence of Christs Body in the Sacrament, and take the Word Transubstantiation precisely, as it signifies that Presence, not with the Bread, but by it's being chang'd into his Body, this is a difference indeed, and the only proper one in this supposition, between him and Catholics, in this matter : But then if he would have proceeded sincerely, and as one that was really Master of so much sense as he talks of in this Treatise, he should have held to his Point, and not impugned what he supposes ; but if he suppose no such Real or Substantial Presence of Christs Body, and under the name of Transubstantiation fight expressly against the Real Presence, through his whole Discourse, as it is evident he doth, (and therefore ought to have call'd it *a Discourse against the Real Presence, and it's consequence Transubstantiation*, and not *a Discourse only, against Transubstantiation* ;) then the difference is not only as he would make it with the Catholics, but with the *Lutherans* also, and those of his own Communion, as King *James*, Bishop *Andrews*, Mr. *Thorndike*, and many others who profess'd to believe the *Body of Christ to be present in the Sacrament no less truly than Catholics do*. But however he compose this difference with them, yet the Catholics, as for their Tenent, do not *think* only, as he says, but are *certain*, as I shall shew in the Process of this Discourse, that they *have the Words of our Saviour*, which they do not doubt to be *Scripture*, on their side. And for the other Point, *viz.* the Administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, they are sure that neither he, nor any of his party have, or ever can prove from the Scripture and our Saviours Institution,

that.

See two Discourses concerning the Adoration of our B. Saviour in the Sacrament Printed at Oxford 1687.

Transubstantiation Defended.

3

that he laid a Command upon all the Faithful to receive it always in both kinds, and this they constantly affirm. But before I leave this Paragraph, I cannot but desire the Reader to take notice of two things, first, That how *sure* soever the Author makes himself, that he hath the *Scripture and our Saviours Institution on his side*, yet his good friend Dr. Tillotson in his Rule of Faith, which he makes *Scripture only to be*, speaking in his own Name, and that of his Party, saith: *We are not Infallibly certain, that any Book (for example S. Matthew or any other of the Evangelists,) is so Ancient as it pretends to be, or that it was Written by him whose Name it bears, or that this is the sense of such and such passages in it, it is possible all this may be otherwise.* The second is, how high soever he talk of the Catholics *not being certain*, and his own being *sure*, of having the *Scripture* for them, yet he doth not vouchsafe to tell us what he means by that *Word*, viz. whether *express Texts*, or *deductions* only. If *express Texts*: Let him produce one, if he can, for that new Article of his Creed, (a Creed much younger than that of Pope Pius the fourth) *I do believe that there is not any Transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, or in the Elements of Bread and Wine, &c.* If *Deductions* only, Why may not the Catholics, who have the *express Words of Scripture*, that it is his Body, infer as surely from thence, that there is a change in the Elements of Bread and Wine, as the Protestants, who have no such *express Text*, that it is not his Body, can do to prove, that there is no change?

DISCOURSE.

Of the first of these I shall now treat, and endeavour to shew against the Church of Rome, That in this Sacrament there is no substantial change made of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Blood of Christ; that Body which was born of the Virgin Mary, and suffered upon the Cross; for so they explain that hard word Transubstantiation.

Transubstantiation Defended.

A N S W E R,

What is meant
by Transubstan-
tiation.

a S. Augustin.
Putaverunt quod
præcisurus esset
Dominus particu-
las quasdam de
corpore suo & da-
turus illis, & dixe-
runt, durus est hic
sermo, ipsi erant
duri, non sermo.
in Psal. 98. ado-
rate scabellum, &c.

Of the former of these I shall now treat, and endeavour to vindicate the Catholic Church, which declares it as an Article of Faith, that by *Vertue of Consecration in the Sacrament*, there is a *Conversion made of the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of our Lord, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his Blood*, which Conversion she conveniently and properly calls *Transubstantiation*, a hard word indeed to those who will not believe the great Mystery expressed by it.

D I S C O U R S E.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon, by the bold confidence of our Adversaries, to dispute a matter of Sense; which is one of those things about which Aristotle hath long since pronounc'd there ought to be no dispute.

A N S W E R.

The argument
from sense shew'd
to be senseless.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon by the bold confidence of our Adversary, not to dispute a matter of sense, (since upon this all parties are agreed, that there ought to be no dispute;) but to Answer all the absurdities, which the Author is engaged in by espousing false principles, and among the rest as the chief, that Sense can judge of the internal nature or substance of things: For, all that is the proper object of Sense, that is, the species, or outward accidents of Bread and Wine, are allowed to be present in the Sacrament by all Catholics as well as Separatists: And we strangely admire, that he should not remember that Rule of his Master Aristotle, which every young Scholar learns, in the beginning of his Logick, that *Substantia non incurrit in sensus*;

sensus ; *Substance is not the object of sense.* From whence it is apparent to all Men that have the use of their Reason, that all the Authors cracking confidence upon this Argument, is founded upon a vulgar Error slyly insinuated, that Catholics believe that which they * *see* in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, to be the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. But lest any should be deceived with this popular Argument, and take up a prejudice against us as in good reason they may, since they are made to believe that we would perswade them out of their Senses ; I shall be so far from endeavouring to do this, as the Author fondly imagins all Catholics do ; that rather out of a deep sentiment of gratitude to the great God of Nature, who hath so fearfully and wonderfully made these Bodies of ours, I shall freely acknowledge that the Senses do not deceive us at all. For the deception doth not lie, at any time, in the Senses, but in the Judgment, and the Senses do always give true hints to the mind, when their Organs and the Medium are rightly disposed, and they are employed about their proper and adequate Objects. What we may certainly conclude from the goodness and veracity of God, is, that he will not deceive Man, the Creature that he loves, and therefore usually those objects which are represented to him by his Senses, as having relation to the conservation of his Body, are of such and such a determinate substance, as the outward and sensible accidents do hint them to be of. So that he is not mistaken in them, unless he judge rashly, and then too there are means provided by which he may correct his Error. Thus the substance of Fire is generally represented under the species or usual form of Fire : Of a Dove under the usual form or likeness of a Dove : (So that we may allow in this manner, that ordinarily the substance doth incur into the mind through the Senses, by means of the accidents, but it is certain that the Senses cannot judge either of the substance or accidents.) Therefore God who is the Author of Nature, and can change it, when he pleaseth, that Man may not be deceived in this kind, doth usually inform him, when he maketh any
substantial

*Quod vidistis
panis est & calix,
quod vobis etiam
oculi vestri re-
nunciant, quod au-
tem fides vestra
postulat instru-
da, panis est cor-
pus Christi, & ca-
lix Sanguis eius.
Augustinus Serm.
ad infant.*

Transubstantiation Defended.

substantial change, of this Nature, in his Creatures, which is above the reason of Man to comprehend, from any hints made by his senses, as being truly Miraculous. Thus, when the Holy Ghost appeared in the form of a Dove, Man was informed by God, that it was really the Holy Ghost in substance of Nature, and not a Dove. When the same Holy Spirit descended upon the Apostles in the Visible appearance of Cloven Tongues of Fire; they had notice from Heaven, that this was truly that Holy Spirit which came in this Visible shape. When Angels appeared in the forms of Men; they had it revealed to them, that they were, notwithstanding, Angels. When our Lord presented himself to his Disciples under the species of Bread, he told them plainly, that it was his Body. To shew which Revelation to have been made, from the Authority of Holy Scripture and Fathers, will be the subject of the ensuing Discourse: This which I have here said, being fully conclusive against the Argument of sense's being properly the Judge of substance. And now who is it that abuseth the senses, the Author, or Catholics? He, by applying them to judge of substance, which is an object that is no ways adequate to them, would make them to deceive Men. We, employing them about their proper objects, which are here the accidents, or outward species of Bread and Wine, which, as by them we are convinced, do still remain after Consecration, prove the Miracle from sense; because at the same time that these appear, the understanding, being enlightened by Faith, discerns the true and real substance of Christs Body, to be veiled under them, which makes the thing truly Miraculous. To employ therefore the senses about their true and adequate objects, and the mind about those which are proper to it, is rational: But to advance sense above reason, and even Faith it self; the Beast above the Man, and the Christian too, as the Author doth, is such a piece of stupidity, as is not to be parallel'd.

DISCOURSE.

It might well seem strange if any Man should write a Book, to prove that an Egg is not an Elephant, and that a Musket-bullet is not a Pike: It is every whit as hard a case, to be put to maintain by a long Discourse, that what we see and handle and taste to be Bread is Bread, and not the Body of a Man; and what we see and taste to be Wine is Wine, and not Blood: And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any farther proof, I do not see why any Man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny anything to be what all the World sees it is; or affirm any thing to be what all the World sees it is not; and this without all possibility of being farther confuted. So that the business of Transubstantiation is not a controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of downright Impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the Sense and Reason of Mankind.

ANSWER.

Here the Author, like another *Lucian* renouncing the Christian Faith, begins to ridicule the most Sacred Mystery of our Religion. I confess I am very unwilling to follow him in such dirty way as he takes. It is not at all suitable to the retiredness, wherein our Devout minds should be entertained, when we conceive of a thing so truly Divine, to speak slightly. I must intreat therefore the Candid Reader, to abstract his thoughts wholly from the Blessed Sacrament, at such time as any of this froth is cast back again upon the Author, which I heartily wish he had spared me the pains of doing; and that he had kept his *Egg* and his *Elephant* to himself: The Analogy would have been more easily made out by those, who maintain that Grace, and Vertue are the *Body and Blood of Christ* verily and indeed received (for so an Egg is virtually at least an Elephant, if according to the principle of the Philosopher, *Omnia animalia generantur ex ovo*; every Animal is generated.

The Catholic Faith ridicul'd by the Adversary.

Transubstantiation Defended.

generated out of an Egg) then by such as hold with the Catholic Church, that the Sacrament is not Bread and Wine, but what verily and indeed it is, the Real Body and Blood of Christ. Now, how to change a *Musket-bullet* into a *Pike*, I confess I know not; The Dragoons better understand that piece of Martial exercise. Howsoever, I must needs acknowledge with the Author, that *it seems strange, that any Man should write a Book, to prove that an Egg is not an Elephant, and that a Musket-bullet is not a Pike*; therefore it is a thousand pities, that so curious a Wit as his, should be concern'd in so absurd an enterprise as he believes his to be. And yet, Good God, what will not the confident presumption of some Men put them upon! he undertakes a task fully as impossible to be performed as that; and of infinitely more dangerous consequence, to prove that not to be, which by the power of God, is really made to be in the Sacrament. The Author knows, that the Catholic Church grounds this wonderful change, made in the Elements, upon *Divine Revelation*, which depends upon the Veracity of God: So that it will not be so very hard a case, to maintain by a discourse much shorter than this of the Author, even our Lords Words of Institution, that what we see, and handle, and taste as Bread, is not Bread in substance, but the Body of Christ; and what we see and taste as Wine, is not Wine in substance, but the Blood of our Saviour. *And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any further proof, I do not see why any Man, that hath confidence enough to do so, may not deny any thing to be what all the World sees it is, or affirm anything to be what all the World sees it is not, (since the Word of God is more Infallible than our senses) and this without all possibility of being farther confuted*; for, he that denies the Veracity of God, can no ways conclude his senses to be veracious. The denial then of the Real Presence, or *Transubstantiation*, is not a Controversy of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of down-right impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and all the sense and reason of Mankind.

Transubstantiation Defended.

9

DISCOURSE.

It is a most Self-evident Falsehood; and there is no Doctrin or Proposition in the World that is of it self more evidently true, than Transubstantiation is evidently false: And yet if it were possible to be true, it would be the most ill natur'd and pernicious truth in the World, because it would suffer nothing else to be true; it is like the Roman-Catholic Church, which will needs be the whole Christian Church, and will allow no other Society of Christians to be any part of it: So Transubstantiation, if it be true at all, it is all truth; for it cannot be true unless our Senses and the Senses of all Mankind be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain, then nothing else can be so; for if we be not certain of what we see, we can be certain of nothing.

ANSWER.

The Doctrin of the real Presence or Transubstantiation is a Truth that is evident upon the Authority of the Revealer; *and there is no Opinion that the Author holds is more evidently false, than this is evidently true: For Faith is the evidence of things not seen, Heb. 11. 1.* and the best natur'd truth in the World it is, which conveys us infinite blessings: Which unless it be so, we have no reason to believe any thing else to be true; a Truth like that of the Catholic Church, which, unless it be that which hath lived in Communion with, and just obedience to her chief Pastors, especially St. Peter and his lawful Successors in the See of Rome, then there hath been no true Church upon the face of the Earth: For so the real Presence or Transubstantiation, unless it be true, we cannot be assured of any truth: It must be so if God be veracious, that is, unless what he reveals be false; since the very truth of our Senses, and all our Faculties, depends upon his Veracity; and if we be not certain of what he hath revealed, though it seem to contradict our Senses, we are certain of nothing.

The Real Presence depends on Gods Veracity.

C

DIS-

Transubstantiation Defended.

DISCOURSE.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a Company of men in the World so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion, as in good earnest to believe this gross and palpable Error, and to impose the belief of it upon the Christian World under no less penalties than of temporal death and eternal damnation. And therefore to undeceive, if possible, these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to examine the pretended grounds of so false a Doctrin, and to lay open the monstrous Absurdity of it.

A N S W E R.

No-transubstantiation an Article of Faith with our Adversaries, and establish'd with Penalties.

See the Penal Laws and Tests.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a Sect of men in the World, so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion, as confidently to deny this revealed truth, and to impose this strange Negative Article of Faith of theirs, That in the Sacrament of the Lords Supper there is not any Transubstantiation of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, at or after Consecration by any person whatsoever, under no less penalties, than the temporal loss of their Estates and Livelihoods, the loss of their Lives, the formal renouncing of the Catholic Faith and Religion, which is dearer to them than their Lives, and consequently Eternal damnation. Therefore to undeceive, (which we hope is possible,) these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to shew the real grounds upon which Transubstantiation is built, that so the monstrous absurdity of the contrary Doctrin may be made to appear.

DISCOURSE.

And in the handling of this Argument, I shall proceed in this plain method.

I. *I shall consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of Rome for this Doctrin.*

II. *I shall produce our Objections against it. And if I can.*

Transubstantiation Defended.

11

can shew that there is no tolerable ground for it, and that there are invincible Objections against it, then every man is not only in reason excused from believing this Doctrin, but hath great cause to believe the contrary.

FIRST, I will consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of Rome for this Doctrin. Which must be one or more of these five. Either 1st. The Authority of Scripture. Or 2ly. The perpetual belief of this Doctrin in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviour's words, This is my Body, in this Sense. Or 3ly. The Authority of the present Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith. Or 4ly. The absolute necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament, to the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament, Or 5ly. To magnifie the power of the Priest, in being able to work so great a Miracle.

1st. They pretend for this Doctrin the Authority of Scripture in those words of our Saviour, This is my Body. Now to shew the insufficiency of this pretence, I shall endeavour to make good these two things.

1. That there is no necessity of understanding those words of our Saviour in the sense of Transubstantiation.

2. That there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise.

A N S W E R.

In the handling of this Argument I shall proceed in this plain method.

The Method of the ensuing Discourse.

I. I shall consider the solid grounds and reasons of the Catholic Church for this Doctrin.

II. I shall weigh the Objections which the Author makes against it. And if I can shew that there is a real ground for it, and that the Objections against it are weak, and inconsiderable, then every man is not only in reason obliged to believe it, but hath great cause to reject the contrary.

First, I shall consider the solid grounds and reasons of the Catholic Church for this Doctrin. Which are at least these five. 1st. The Authority of Scripture. 2ly. The perpe-

Transubstantiation Defended.

tual belief of this Doctrin in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviours words, This is my Body, in this Sense. Or 3ly. The Authority of the Church in every Age to declare, propose, and exhibit, when, by misinterpretation of Heretics, they are forc'd to it, a more explicit Sense of the Ancient Articles of our Faith. Or 4ly. The infinite Mercy and condescension of God to operate such a change as this, for the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament. Or 5ly. The just dignity of the Priest, whom God is pleas'd to make use of as his Minister for the working so miraculous a change.

1st. The Catholic Church hath always grounded the Doctrin of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation upon the Authority of Divine Revelation in these words of our Saviour, *This is my Body.* Now to shew the validity of this Proof I shall endeavour to make good these two things.

I. *That there is a necessity of understanding these words of our Saviour in the Sense of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation.* From whence it will necessarily follow,

II. *That there is no reason at all for the understanding them otherwise.*

DISCOURSE.

First, *That there is no necessity to understand those words of our Saviour in the sense of Transubstantiation. If there be any, it must be from one of these two Reasons. Either because there are no figurative expressions in Scripture, which I think no man ever yet said: or else, because a Sacrament admits of no figures; which would be very absurd for any man to say, since it is of the very nature of a Sacrament to represent and exhibit some invisible grace and benefit by an outward sign and figure: And especially since it cannot be denied, but that in the institution of this very Sacrament our Saviour useth figurative expressions and several words which cannot be taken strictly and literally. When he gave the Cup, he said, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of Sins. Where first, the Cup is put for Wine.*

Wine contained in the Cup; or else if the words be literally taken, so as to signifie a substantial change, it is not of the Wine but of the Cup; and that, not into the Blood of Christ, but into the New Testament, or new Covenant in his Blood. Besides, that his Blood is said then to be shed, and his Body to be broken, which was not till his Passion, which followed the Institution and first celebration of this Sacrament.

A N S W E R.

First, That there is a necessity of understanding those words of our Saviour in the Sense of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation, For these two Reasons. 1. Because although there be many figurative expressions in Scripture, which all men allow, yet this, in relation to the Case in hand, is not such. 2. Although a Sacrament admits of Figures, which no man is so absurd as to deny, since it is of the very nature of a Sacrament, to represent and exhibit some invisible grace and benefit by an outward Sign and Figure; Yet the Figure doth not lie where the Author pretends it doth. The Rule which men ought to observe in their discourse in relation to Figures is this, That a Figure should not be used which the Auditor doth not easily apprehend to be so. To compare, therefore, a Figure, which all the World can easily understand to be so, with an expression which no man can construe to be a Figure, according to the Rules of human Discourse, is very absurd: Yet such is the Authors instance from Scripture. From whence he alledgeth, that when our Saviour gave the Cup, he said, *This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, which is shed*, (or more properly poured out) *for you, and for many, for the remission of Sins*. Did not our Lord plainly read in the minds of his Disciples, that, by the Cup, they would understand, that which was contained in the Cup? If any one should advise the Author, when he is thirsty, to drink off his Glass, would he be so inconsiderate as to swallow it together with the Wine? Nay further, so unhappy is the Author, as to urge this instance of holy Scripture in the first place, which alone is enough

The necessity of understanding our Lords words in the Sense of the Real Presence.

Transubstantiation Defended.

enough fully to clear the Point against him. Neither the Apostles, nor any men else could be so ignorant of the manner of human discourse, as not to apprehend, that our Saviour, by the *Cup*, meant what was contained in it, which was most certainly Christs Blood; for otherwise it could not be said of it, as it is *Luke 22. 20.* that it was then poured out for the Apostles, and for many, for the remission of Sins: it is said, *is poured out*, in the Present Tense; not, *shall be poured out*, in the Future; therefore here can be meant, only the Blood of Christ, as now poured out in the Sacrament for them, not as it was afterwards shed from his Crucified Body upon the ground. The Original runs thus,

Luke 22. 20.

τὸ τοῦ ποτήριον ἢ καὶ νῦν διαθήκη, ἐν τῷ αἵματι μου, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ἐκχυνόμενον: Where in construction *ἐκχυνόμενον* agrees with *ποτήριον*, and not with *αἷματι*. And Wine as a Figure only of Christs Blood, or signifying its virtue, could not be poured out for the remission of Sins: You might with more congruity of Speech,

* *hoc Simulacrum est virgo quod filium Dei peperit.*

affirm of an Image of the Blessed Virgin, * *This is that which conceived the Son of God*; because in this there is some plain resemblance to the Prototype. *Beza* a great Critic, in his way, though an Adversary to the Catholic Doctrin in this Point, not being able to deny this Proof, would rather have the Scripture to be thought false, although that be the whole Foundation of their Faith, than change his Opinion; and faith, that it is a * *Solecism*, and should be *ἐκχυνόμενα*: He concludes that the holy Spirit, or St. *Luke*, that divinely inspired Pen-man, the most eloquent of all the Evangelists, could be sooner mistaken, though in a matter of so great moment, than himself; or else he would have the Scripture to be falsified, and corrupt, in this place, and not himself. For he acknowledges that all the ancient Manuscripts which he had seen, and even his own, which was of great Authority, and of *venerable Antiquity, veneranda Antiquitatis*, together with the Syriac Version, to which he gives this Elogy, that it was deservedly accounted to be of *greatest authority, maxima meritò authoritatis*, did conspire together, to refer the effusion of Blood to the Cup. The Author, therefore, and all that separate from the Catholic Church

in

in this Point, must either, at last, be forced to confess here, as * *Beza* doth concerning those words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, That *this saying thus exprest cannot be retained, but it must prove Transubstantiation, after the manner of the Papists*; or else that the Holy Scripture, the Foundation of Christian Faith, is made invalid: So that it is plain from what hath been said, that *the Cup is here put for what is contained in the Cup*, and that the words, so taken, do signifie, and operate a substantial Change, not of the *Cup*, but of the *Wine in the Cup*; and that, not into the *New Testament*, or *Covenant*, but into the *Blood of Christ*, in which this *New Covenant*, or *Testament* is made, sealed and confirmed. Besides, that his *Blood is said*, here, then to be poured out, and his *Body, then to be broken, and given for us*, which they could not be unless they were then really in the Sacrament; because the Passion, (wherein * his Body was pierced only, not broken, as in the Sacrament, and his Blood was shed from his Crucified Body upon the ground, not only poured forth from one Vessel to another, and drunk as in the Sacrament,) followed the Institution and first Celebration of this Sacrament.

* *Contra Wesphal: Hoc quidem sepe diximus. quod nunc quoque repetam, reineri reipsa non posse, Tò pñ Tòy in his Christi verbis, hoc est corpus meum: quin Transubstantiatis papistica statuatur.*

Compare * *Joh. 19. 36. A bone of him shall not be broken, with 1 Cor. 11. 24. This is my Body which is broken for you* Which gave occasion to St. Chrysostome to say of Christ, that that which he did not suffer upon the Cross for the love of thee, he suffers in the Eucharist: *This is my Body which is broken for you.*

DISCOURSE.

But that there is no necessity to understand our Saviour's words in the sense of Transubstantiation, I will take the plain concession of a great number of the most learned Writers of the Church of Rome in this Controversie. (a) Bellarmin, (b) Suarez and (c) Vasques do acknowledg Scotus the great Schoolman to have said that this Doctrin cannot be evidently proved from Scripture: And Bellarmin grants this not to be improbable; and Suarez and Vasques acknowledg (d) Durandus to have said as much. (e) Ocham, another famous Schoolman, says expressly, that the Doctrin which holds the Substance of the Bread and Wine to remain after Consecration is neither repugnant to Reason nor to Scripture. (f) Petrus ab Alliaco, Cardinal of Cambray, says plainly, That the Doctrin of the Substance of Bread and Wine remaining after

Consecration

- (a) de Euch. l. 3. c. 21.
- (b) in 3. dis. 49. Qu. 75. Sest. 2.
- (c) in 3. part. disp. 180. Qu. 75. art. 2. c. 5.
- (d) in Sent. l. 4. dist. 11. Qu. 1. n. 15.
- (e) in 4. Sent. Qu. 5. & Quodl. 4. Qu. 3.
- (f) in 4. Sent. Qu. 6. art. 2.

Transubstantiation Defended.

Consecration is more easie, and free from Absurdity, more rational and no ways repugnant to the Authority of Scripture; *nay more, that for the other Doctrin, viz. of Transubstantiation, there is no evidence in Scripture.* (g) Gabriel Biel, *another great Schoolman and Divine of their Church, freely declares, that as to any thing expres'd in the Canon of the Scriptures, a man may believe that the substance of Bread and Wine doth remain after Consecration: and therefore he resolves the belief of Transubstantiation into some other Revelation besides Scripture, which he supposeth the Church had about it.* Cardinal (h) Cajetan *confesseth that the Gospel doth no where express that the Bread is changed into the Body of Christ; that we have this from the Authority of the Church: Nay, he goes farther, That there is nothing in the Gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, this is my Body, in a proper and not a metaphorical Sense; but the Church having understood them in a proper Sense, they are to be so explained: Which words in the Roman Edition of Cajetan are expunged by order of Pope (i) Pius V. Cardinal (k) Contarenus, and (l) Melchior Canus one of the best and most judicious Writers that Church ever had, reckon this Doctrin among those which are not so expressly found in Scripture. I will add but one more, of great authority in the Church, and a reputed Martyr, (m) Fisher Bishop of Rochester, who ingenuously confesseth, that in the words of the Institution there is not one word from whence the true Presence of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in our Mass can be proved: So that we need not much contend, that this Doctrin hath no certain foundation in Scripture, when this is so fully and frankly acknowledged by our Adversaries themselves.*

A N S W E R.

The Sense of the Schoolmen corrupted and their problematical Discourse mistaken for their Conclusion by the Adversary.

The Author hath had very little Success yet, in that, which he calls, a Discourse against Transubstantiation; therefore because he would now do some Execution, he is

forc't

(g) In canon
M. f. L. 40.

(h) In Aquin.
3 part. Q. 75.
art. 1.

(i) Agid. Co-
nick. de Sacram.
Q. 75 art. 1 n. 13.

(k) de Sacram.
l. 3 c. 3.

(l) Loc. Theolog.
l. 3. c. 3.

(m) Contra Caj-
etan. Babylon
c. 10. n. 2.

forc't to come down to his Adversaries to sharpen his blunt Weapons. Which, notwithstanding will prove no advantage to his Cause. He here, then, tells us in his first Period, That he will take the plain Concession of a great number of the most Learned Writers of the Church of Rome in this Controversie, that there is *NO* necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation. But what if it manifestly appear from the Words of these Writers, that he takes this by force, which they never gave him; since they all thought themselves bound to accept the Words in that Sense which they acknowledge the Church to have given of them, as deducible from Scripture by necessary Consequence, tho' not so plainly prov'd from the bare Words, consider'd by themselves, as you shall see from their Authorities hereunder cited? Then he proceeds, like a false Mustermaster, to make up the number of his List, by calling Men that are not in it, to answer to other Names than their own. *Bellarmin, Suarez, and Vasquez* do acknowledge *Scotus*, &c. Again, *Bellarmin* grants this not to be improbable; and *Suarez and Vasquez* acknowledge *Durandus* to have said as much. Here they are wheel'd about a second time to make the greater Show; yet there are but two Men in effect after all this calling. The Author says, *Bellarmin, and Suarez, and Vasquez* say, Such a Man said such a Thing: Why, such a blundering sort of an Evidence would be flung out of any inferior Court of Judicature; it falters so manifestly at the very beginning, that we may assure our selves it can never speak clearly. Let us see therefore what * *Scotus* saith for himself; his Words are these: If you say that Christ, by saying *This is my Body*, doth plainly teach us, that the Bread doth not remain, for then the Proposition would be false; this is not cogent: for supposing (so that 'tis but a Supposition still) the Substance of Bread did still remain, the Substance of Bread is not demonstrated here, but what is contain'd under the Bread, as now the Accidents are shew'd, for then the Proposition would be false; but the Sense is, that which shall be contain'd under this sensible Sign, is my Body. Mark, how much *Scotus* fa-

See all the Citations above in the Margent of the Author's last Section as they are plac'd in order.

* Si dicar, quod Christus, dicendo, hoc est corpus meum, expresse instruit panem non remanere, quia tunc esset propositio falsa, hoc non cogit, quia dato quod substantia panis minueretur, non demonstratur substantia panis, sed continentium sub pane; sicut modo monstratur accidentis, quia tunc esset propositio falsa, sed est sensus, hoc quod erit consentum sub signo sensibili est corpus meum.

(a) *Scotus ubi
 supra. Ponitur
 veritas aliquorum
 credendorum mi-
 ni explicita quam
 habetur in Sym-
 bolo Apostolorum,
 vel Athanasii, vel
 Niceno, & be-
 nigne quicquid ibi
 dicitur esse cre-
 dendum reveren-
 dum est de sub-
 stantia fidei, &
 hoc post illam de-
 clarationem so-
 lemne factum
 ab Ecclesia —
 Dico quod eo sen-
 su expressa sunt
 Scripturae quo
 cordis. — Et
 ideo tunc intel-
 lectum eligit, quia
 verus est; non
 enim in potestate
 Ecclesie fuit fa-
 cere istud verum
 vel non verum,
 sed Dei insinu-
 entis; sed intel-
 lectum a Deo
 traditum Ecclesia
 explicat, &c.*

* *Omnino, Alto-
 gether.*

* See the Preface
 to this Discourse.

vors the Author's Opinion of the Senses being Judges of what is in the Sacrament. Again he saith, (a) *The truth of some things that are to be believ'd, is more explicitly set down than in the Apostolic, Athanasian, or Nicene Creed; and in brief, whatsoever is (by the Catholic Church) propos'd to our Belief, is to be held of the substance of Faith, after a solemn Declaration made by the Church;* he gives the Reason afterwards, *Because the Scriptures are Expounded by the same Spirit by which they were made:* And thus he concludes, telling us in plain terms, *That the Church therefore chose this Sense of Transubstantiation, because it is true; for it was not in the Power of the Church to make it true or false, but of God Instituting it: But the Church Explain'd the Sense which was deliver'd by God.* And if it be so, that Transubstantiation was the true Sense, and that before the Declaration of the Council, then there was a necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, according to Scotus, as well before as after the Council, since 'twas the Sense deliver'd by God. Therefore when the Author saith he hath the plain Concession of a great number of the most Learned Writers of the Church of Rome, reckoning Scotus in the first place, that there is NO necessity to understand our Saviour's Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, he saith that which is not true. Bellarmine indeed grants what Scotus said of the substance of Bread remaining (notwithstanding its being converted into the substance of Christ's Body, as I shall presently shew) that it is not *ALTOGETHER* improbable, *Non omnino improbabile*, altho' there may be great Improbability in the thing notwithstanding, (mark the * Word which the Author is pleas'd to leave out) *that there is no place of Scripture extant so express, as that, without the Declaration of the Church (which notwithstanding clears the whole matter) can evidently compel us to admit of Transubstantiation, viz. in the Sense of the Thomists, whose way of Explication of it is somewhat different from Scotus's.* But that not being of Faith, there ought to be no Controversie about it, and therefore the * Council of Trent directly Condemn'd neither of these Ways.

Ways. And (b) *Durandus* himself after he has Discours'd Problematically upon the Point, like a Schoolman, at last concludes solidly: That *that is not always to be chosen in matters of Faith, which hath fewest difficulties consequent to it--- That the substance of Bread and Wine is chang'd into the substance of Christs Body*: That *that only is principally effected in this Sacrament, which is signified by the form of the words, viz. of Consecration*. Which Argument being urg'd by him from Scripture for Transubstantiation, is a plain Evidence that he did not deny the necessity of understanding our Saviours words in that Sense: For he concludes positively from Scripture, *that both these things are made to be in this Sacrament, viz. The Existence of the Body of Christ and the Conversion of the Bread into it*: And what is this but Transubstantiation? Therefore what the Authors abovemention'd say concerning *Scotus* and *Durandus*, is to be applied rather to their particular manner of explicating the Doctrin of Transubstantiation, than to the thing it self, since many (c) other Authors do not think them to be mistaken in the Point.

(b) *Durandus* Tria solide ponit. Primo, quod substantia panis & vini convertitur in substantiam corporis Christi. Secundo, quod modum tali conversione corpus & sanguis Christi virtute Divina habent rationem ordinis seu habitudinem ad speciem, sub quibus fuerunt panis & vinum quod sunt eis r aliter praesentis. Tertio, quod quicunque ille modus sit de facto, non est tamen negandum quin alius modus sit Deo possible: concludendo for the first he gives his reasons for it: 1. In his quae sunt si se non est sem-

per eligendum illud ad quod sequuntur pauciores difficultates, &c. 2. Quod illud solum efficitur in hoc Sacramento principaliter, quod significatur per formam verborum. — utrumque efficitur in hoc Sacramento, scilicet Existencia corporis Christi & conversio panis. (c) So he that writes the *Scholia* upon this Author, ab. n. 13. Vana sunt ergo quae ex hoc *Suarez* & *Scotus* obijciunt contra *Scotum*, cui falso imponit *Scotus*, quod asserat Ecclesiam accepisse Transubstantiationem a Doctoribus. Vid. etiam Card. Peron. De his auctoritatibus.

(d) *Ocham* seems to allow, that the substance of Bread may remain tho' it forsake its accidents, and the substance of Christ's Body doth not forsake them; and this according to him was one way of solving Transubstantiation, which he is far from saying to be contrary either to Reason or Scripture.

(d) *Ochamus*. In altari est vera transubstantiatio corporis Christi, sed hoc potest multis modis poni. Uno modo ponendo quod remaneat ibi substantia panis, & cum hoc quod

corpus Christi coexistit substantiae illi, ita quod prima substantia sit deferens accidentia, Secunda non, sed tantum coexistens: alio modo quod recedat substantia panis subito de illo loco ad alium locum, & remaneant accidentia, & eis coexistat corpus Christi. Tertio, quod redigatur in materiam per se stantem, viz. aliam formam recipientem, & hoc sive in eodem sive in alio, & tunc illi materiae & accidentibus coexistat corpus Christi. Quarto, quod substantia panis redigatur in nihil. Quodlibet istorum est possibile.

Transubstantiation Defended.

(e) Petrus ab
Alliaco Card.
Tertia opinio fuit,
quod substantia
panis reminet;
& hoc potest dupli-
citer imaginari,
uno modo: —
quod remaneat
ibidem ubi corpus
Christi incipit esse,
& sic diceretur
substantia panis
transire in sub-
stantiam corporis:
quoniam ubi est
hoc, incipit esse illud, &c. — prior quidem ille modus est possibilis, nec repugnat rationi, nec auctoritati Biblicæ,
imo est facilius ad intelligendum, & rationalior quam aliquis eorum.

(e) *Petrus ab Alliaco* Cardinal of Cambray was of Opinion that it was possible, and not repugnant to Reason nor the Authority of the Bible, nay that it was more easie to be understood, and more reasonable that the substance of Bread should remain there where the Body of Christ begins to be, and that so the substance of the Bread should be said to pass into the substance of the Body of Christ. So that here is Transubstantiation still plainly maintain'd in his Sense; and he doth not believe that there was need of any other Revelation for it, than Scripture.

(f) Gabriel Biel.
Quamvis expresse
includatur in Scri-
ptura, quod corpus
Christi veritate
sub speciebus panis
continetur, & a si-
delibus sumitur,
tamen quomodo ibi
sit Christi corpus,
an per conversionem
alicujus in
ipsum: an sine
conversione in-
cipiat esse corpus
Christi cum pane
in panibus sub-
stantia & acci-
dentibus panis,
non invenitur expressum in Canone Biblicæ.

(f) *Gabriel Biel* tells us, that although it be expressly deliver'd in Scripture, that the Body of Christ is truly contain'd under the Species of Bread, and receiv'd by the Faithful, yet it is not found expressly in the Canon of the Bible; how the Body of Christ is there, whether by the Conversion of something into it: or whether the Body of Christ begins to be with the Bread without Conversion, the substance and accidents of the Bread remaining; But he doth not deny the former of these ways to be necessarily deduc'd from Scripture; and therefore this Authority makes nothing against us. Cardinal Cajetan's words were censur'd and expunged by Authority, and therefore ought not to be brought against us.

(g) Contarenus
Cardinal.
Omnes Theologi
conveniunt, licet
non sit prodium
in Sacris, rationis
tamen ductum se-
quentes, quod fieri
istud non queat
motu locali, sed
mutatione qua-
dam substantiæ
panis in corpus
Christi, quam appellant Transubstantiationem.

(g) Cardinal *Contarenus* freely declares, that all Divines agree, although it be not plainly deliver'd, viz. not in express words, yet following Reason as their Guide (and what is this but necessary rational deduction?) That this (viz. which is done in the Sacrament) cannot be effected by a local motion, but by some change of the substance of Bread into the Body of Christ, which is call'd Transubstantiation?

(h) *Melchior*

(h) *Melchior Canus* doth acknowledg that *the Church* hath by the Spirit of Truth explain'd some things which are accounted obscure in the Holy Writings, and that She doth justly judge the Authors of the contrary Opinions to be *Heretics*. But things may be necessarily contain'd in Scripture, altho' with some obscurity. So that there is not so much as one of these Authors, (unless it be that which is condemn'd by the Church, and therefore in that Point is none of ours) who hath told us, That there is *no necessity* to understand our Saviours Words in the Sense of Transubstantiation.

(h) Melchior Canus. Nonnulla per spiritum veritatis explicuit Ecclesia, quæ in Sacris literis habentur obscura. — Ecclesia hereticos judicat contrariorum dogmatum Auctores.

Lastly, As if that true Martyr Bishop Fisher, had not suffer'd enough already, the Author exercises further cruelty against him, by a false and imperfect recital of his words, and corrupting their Sense. This Holy Bishop indeed, speaking of the words of Institution, saith:
 (a) *There is not one word put here, by which it can be prov'd, that in OUR Mass the true Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ is made to be, which last words, Is made to be,* The Author falsly renders by these words, *can be proved*. But this good Martyr doth not say, that Christs words of Institution are not to be understood in the Sense of the True and Real Presence of his Body, as made to be in that Sacrament which our Lord himself Consecrated; but that the Power of Priests, NOW, to Consecrate in our Mass after the same manner, is not express'd in the bare words of Institution; And it is evident from the immediately following words of this Reverend Bishop, that this is his true Sense, which words run thus: *For altho' Christ made of the Bread his Flesh, and of the Wine his Blood, it doth not therefore follow by vertue of any word here plac'd, that WE shall effect the same as often as we endeavor it: As is also plain from the other words of this Reverend Authors in the same Chapter. Without the Interpretation of the Fathers, and the usage of the Church by them deliver'd down unto us, no body will prove out of the bare words of Scripture, that any Priest can Consecrate the true Body and Blood of Christ,----- For, although we allow Christ to have said (what*
 (a) De Evangelis loquens, ait, neque ullum hic verbum positum est quo probetur, in nostra missa veram fieri carnis & sanguinis Christi presentiam. Nam etsi Christus ex pane carnem suam, & ex vino sanguinem effecerit, non ob id consequitur virtute alicujus verbi hic positi nos quoties id ipsum tentaverimus, idem effecturos. ib. cap. 10. not. 2. Edit. Wirceburgi A. MD. DC. XCVII.

Scrip-

Citra Patrum interpretationem, & usum nobis ab eisdem traditum, nemo probabit ex

ipsis nudis Evangelii verbis Sacerdotem quempiam veram Christi carnem & sanguinem consecrare.—

Nam ut largiamur, Christum Apostoli dixisse, ut ex Luca & Paulo, non propterea consequitur quod omnibus eorum posteris eandem tradiderit potestatem. Nam illis data fuit potestas ejiciendi demones.

(b) Contra Caprinat. Babil. C. 4. n. 11. De Patribus Concilii Lateranensis quarti loquens. Si substantia panis in Christi corpus convertatur quem admodum illi definierunt, non debuit aliter dixisse Christus quam dixerit. Si maneat substantia panis, quanquam tunc aliter dixisse Christus debuerat, tamen per unius adjectionem vocula potuisset totam hanc discordiam sustinuisse. Nam si dixisset hic panis est corpus meum, hoc vinum est sanguis meus, Omnis omnino sublata tui conversionis.

Scripture saith he did in this kind) to the Apostles out of Luke and Paul, it doth not therefore follow, that he gave the same Power to all that were to succeed them, for a Power of casting out Devils was given to the Apostles. But that this Learned and Pious Bishop asserted the change of the substance of the Bread into the Body of Christ to be the necessary Sense of the words of Christ, *This is my Body*, is clear from these words of his: (b) *If the Substance*, saith he, *of Bread is changed into Christs Body, Christ ought not to have said otherwise than he hath said*: And again, *If the substance of Bread remain, then Christ ought to have spoke otherwise*. We must take notice, that this Pious Bishop was defending Tradition as necessary for the Interpretation of some places of Scripture, and particularly such which relate to the Power that those who succeed the Apostles have to Consecrate, and upon very good Grounds, since without Tradition, we cannot conclude the Scripture it self to be the Word of God; and no Church can prove the Succession of her Pastors to this high Function, which is without doubt a Fundamental Point. Since therefore the Protestants hold, that there is a lawful Succession of Pastors in Gods Church, as necessary to the Salvation of Mankind, as evidently deduced from Scripture, interpreted by Tradition, tho' not from the bare words of the Institution of the Eucharist, no less than Catholics; and that they have as full a Right to Consecrate as the Apostles themselves, they must therefore allow that they do do so: And then there can be no doubt rais'd from the words of this holy Bishop, but that *Christ's Body and Blood* are truly in the Sacrament by way of Transubstantiation, which Doctrin he allows to have a certain Foundation in Scripture. But the Author here would rather pull down the Pillars on which the Church of *Christ* stands, by interrupting the Episcopal Succession, and undermine its very Foundation, than not set a Face upon his Argument, that he may thereby delude unwary Christians. Upon the whole matter, it is plain from what hath been said; 1. That not any of these Catholic Authors, which

which are cited, held that there was *no necessity* to understand our Saviours words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, but the contrary. 2. That they indeed differed only about some curious Speculations concerning the Dependences and Circumstances of this Doctrin of Transubstantiation, which they Discours'd of in a Problematical way; as for instance; Whether this Transubstantiation is a Mutation and Transubstantiation Productive, that is to say, by vertue of which the Substance of the Body is produc'd from the Substance of Bread; or a Mutation and Transubstantiation Adductive, that is to say, by vertue of which the Substance of Bread ceases to be; and that of the Body be Introdu'd in it's place: And whether in this Adductive Transubstantiation, the Cessation of the Substance of Bread and Wine, is to be call'd Annihilation; or whether it ought to be exempt from this Name, for as much as, altho' it cease to be, nevertheless this Cessation of it's Essence hath not Non-entity for it's final Term, but the Substitution of the Essence of the Body of Christ, or the like; and such kind of disputes which did not at all relate to the Essence of the Article of Transubstantiation, but only to some consequences, and modes of it; for all the School-men agree, That the Bread and Wine are chang'd and Transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, by vertue of Consecration, the Substances of Bread and Wine ceasing to be, and those of the Body and Blood being substituted in their place. 3. They evidently deduce the Essential part of the Doctrin of Transubstantiation from Scripture; and altho some few of them do sometimes say, that the bare words of Scripture do not *compell us* to believe the less material consequences of it, yet they do not deny that these also may be rationally deduc'd. 4. The Author doth not pretend to prove from these Authorities, that these Writers did not hold the Real Presence of Christs Body here, but only a sign and vertue of it, as Protestants do, since it is clear from all their Writings, that they did hold it, as proved from Scripture. Altho I might have saved my self the trouble of
of

Transubstantiation Defended.

of clearing this point so largely, had I not thought it convenient rather for the vindication of these Writers, whom the Author hath so grossly abused, than for the defending the Doctrin of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation. For what if seven Authors should before the Solemn Declaration of the Church have denied it to be necessarily proved from Scripture, tho' really they have not; Are there not seventy times seven of another mind? Were not the *Arian* Bishops, the *Semi-Pelagians* and other Heretics, who at several times oppos'd the Articles of the Christian Faith, vastly more numerous? And the Author knows, that Catholic Christians are not to rely upon the Judgment of any inconsiderable number of private Doctors Opinions concerning the Sense of an Article of Religion, but upon the Judgment of the generality of Catholic Fathers, which is discerned in their Writings, and in the Decisions of the most General Councils, and in the constant and general Tradition of the Church.

DISCOURSE.

Secondly, *If there be no necessity of understanding our Saviour's words in the Sense of Transubstantiation, I am sure there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise. Whether we consider the like Expressions in Scripture; as where our Saviour says he is the Door, and the true Vine (which the Church of Rome would mightily have triumph'd in, had it been said, This is my true Body.) And so likewise where the Church is said to be Christ's Body; and the Rock which follow'd the Israelites to be Christ, 1 Cor. 10. 4. They drank of that rock which follow'd them, and that rock was Christ: All which and innumerable more like Expressions in Scripture every Man understands in a Figurative, and not in a strictly Literal and absurd Sense. And it is very well known, that in the Hebrew Language things are commonly said to be that which they do signifie and represent; and there is not in that Language a more proper and usual way of expressing a thing to signifie so and so, than to say that it is so and so. Thus Joseph Expound-*
ing

ing Pharaoh's Dream to him, Gen. 41. 26. says, The seven good Kine are seven years, and the seven good Ears of Corn are seven years, that is, they signifi'd or represented seven years of plenty; and so Pharaoh understood him, and so would any Man of Sense understand the like Expressions; nor do I believe that any sensible Man, who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded upon these words of our Saviour, This is my Body, would upon reading the Institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel ever have imagin'd any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in those words; but would have understood his meaning to have been, this Bread signifies my Body, this Cup signifies my Blood; and this which you see me now do, do ye hereafter for a Memorial of me: But surely it would never have entred into any man's Mind to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himself in his Hand, and give away himself from himself with his own Hands.

A N S W E R.

Secondly, Since there is a necessity of understanding our Saviours words in the Sense of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation, I am sure there can be no reason given to understand them otherwise. For if we consider the expressions which the Author produceth out of Scripture as resembling these, they are so far from being like them, that from thence we shall prove the quite contrary to what the Author alledgeth them for: Therefore, to reduce this Head of Discourse to some Method; I shall first lay down the Principles by which it is to be governed, that I may the better afterwards draw my Conclusion.

The Disparity between the Figurative expressions in H. Scripture and the words of Institution, This is my Body, shews that the latter are to be taken properly.

1. Christ ever spake reasonably, and in a manner conformable to good Sense, nothing escaping him through imprudence or mistake.
2. His Power infinitely exceeds the capacity of our minds; therefore it is against reason, that we should confine it to the narrow bounds of our understanding, or pretend that God cannot do what we cannot conceive.

Principles upon which the ensuing Discourse is grounded. See M. Arnaud Tom. 2. l. 1. 2. 3. Jusse de lae re.

Transubstantiation Defended.

3. When the Sense of the words which Christ speaks, if taken properly, is not contradictory to Right Reason, tho' above it, and the Rules of human Discourse oblige us to take these words in the proper Sense, then we are not to doubt of the Truth of them as so taken.

How Catholics
Interpret the
words of Institu-
tion, and how
Protestants.

That we may the better apply these Principles, and the ensuing Discourse to the Case in hand, I shall endeavor to State it as precisely as may be, and draw it into as narrow a compass as I can. Christ in the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament said, *THIS IS MY BODY*: Which words Those of the English Church, that do not believe the Presence of Christs Real Body in the Sacrament, yet Attribute the efficacy thereof to the due Reception of the Sacramental Elements (and I will Charitably suppose the Author to be one of these) interpret thus: This thing, which you see to be Bread in Substance, is a Sign of my Real Body, wherein the vertue of my Body, tho' it self be absent, is contained; or whereunto this vertue is conjoyned, or together with which it is exhibited; which several sorts of expressions I am forc't to use, that I may by some of them reach that Sense which they have not yet sufficiently explained. Catholics thus: This thing, which by the means of your Senses, is represented to the mind under the Species or Appearance of Bread, is my Body in Substance.

In these Explications, I say, that by, *This*, in the Proposition, *This is my Body*, is meant, *this thing*; because *this* is a Pronoun Demonstrative, that doth not express any particularly determinate, and distinct Nature or Substance: For it may be applied to any thing that is the object of Sense, or of pure Understanding, when it is but confusedly represented to the mind: As we say pointing to a person before us, *This is John*, or *this is Thomas*, pointing to an Animal, we say, *This is a Lamb*, *this is a Dove*; after we have discoursed of the nature of the Soul, we may say of *Cogitation*, conceiving it in our minds, *This is the property of the Soul*. But because it would be great rashness of judgment, and that which is strictly called prejudice,

prejudice, to conclude fully of the nature of any thing, which another, that is presumed to know it better than we do, should be shewing to us, before he hath fully pronounced his Proposition, by which he is to discover it's nature : As for instance, if any one holding up a Gilt Shilling, or a Counterfeit Guiny ; should be about to inform us truly, that *this* was but a Shilling, or a Counterfeit piece of Gold, which notwithstanding appeared to the Senses like Gold, we should rashly conclude, before he tells us fully, what it is he shews us, that it is a true piece of Gold : Or on the other hand, if any one should hold up a true piece of Gold, which is discoloured so by Sulphur, that it looks but like Silver, and should be informing us, that *this* is a piece of true Gold, we should, before he hath spoke his words, conclude it was but Silver : So it would have been prejudice in our Lord's Disciples, to have concluded of the determinate nature of that, which he held in his Hands, when he was going to tell them, what it really was, viz. his Body, before he had fully pronounced the Proposition, saying, *This is my Body* : Which the Sacramentarians and our Author do, rashly determining the thing which appears as Bread, to be so in Substance, upon the exhibiting the Species, and saying, *This*, which notwithstanding, when the Proposition is finished, is in the Sacrament made and declared to be the Body of Christ : *This* therefore being a Pronoun demonstrative, it is enough, that it exhibits something unto us, under a certain outward appearance, without signifying distinctly and clearly the whole nature of the thing, for it is the property of the Attribute or thing, that is affirmed of another, to add clearness to the subject, or thing of which it is affirmed, by explaining the nature of the thing, intended to be demonstrated in the Proposition, more fully ; otherwise the Proposition would be ridiculous ; as if one should say, this Bread is Bread, or this my Body is my Body. *This* therefore in the Proposition, *This is my Body*, only discovers some Real Thing which appears in such a manner ; as for instance, the Species of Bread, to the Senses, which

Transubstantiation Defended.

our Saviour, who was Truth it self, who did know the truth of all things, and could alter the nature of any Created thing, by his Word, declares fully unto them to be his Body, tho' under such an appearance; so that, whether the change was made before, or at that very instant of time, when our Lord spake the words, the latter of which is the general opinion of Catholics; the Proposition is strictly true in a proper Sense.

In what Sense
Catholics allow a
Figure in the
Sacrament.

I shall only premise one thing more, before I examine the Authors pretended proofs from Scripture, because I would by no means make the breach betwixt us wider than it is, which is this, That Catholics acknowledge a Figure in the Sacrament, no less than Protestants. Thus the Bread and Wine, before Consecration being distinct things, and separate one from the other, do resemble Christs Body and Blood separated upon the Cross, and his Soul separated from his Body, altho' they could not do this in their own nature; and till, after the first Institution, they were exposed upon the Altar for such a use, as might make us consider them as such resemblances, since there is not so much of natural likeness, as to call the Idea of the Passion into our mind. We believe also, that after Consecration, Christs Body in the Sacrament under the Veils of the Species of Bread and Wine, is a Figure, Similitude, or Exemplar of the same Body of Christ, as it suffer'd upon the Cross, in like manner as his Body when newly born, was a Resemblance, and Exemplar, and express Image of his Body at full growth: But this we conclude, not from those words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, which must still be understood in a proper Sense; but from the nature of the thing it self, after the Institution known to be made. From whence we firmly believe the Body of Christ to be there; it being of the nature of a Sacrament to represent and exhibit something more unto us, than what it outwardly appears to be.

I now proceed to consider the Expressions which the Author produceth out of Scripture, by which he would prove

a Figurative Presence of Christs Body, in opposition to a Real one in the Catholic Sense. And this being the main Proof upon which those, who have renounced the Authority of the Church do pretend to build their Faith, since they allow that nothing ought to be admitted as an Article of Faith which is not clearly deduced from hence ; and consequently nothing ought to be condemned as *contrary* to the Christian Faith, but what is manifestly repugnant to this. From hence then it is, that he should bring an evidence, which is able to overthrow the Authority of so many Councils, and several of them General ones, as have determined this Point against him, and to shew plainly that the whole true visible Church of Christ, which hath for near MDCC years received the Doctrin of the Real Presence of Christs Body, hath erred in so necessary a Point of Faith, and been guilty of Idolatry, even grosser than that of the Heathen World, as the Author pretends; notwithstanding the Evidence of the same Holy Scripture, that the Holy Spirit shall lead it into all Truth, and that the Gates of Hell shall not be able to prevail against it. Let us see therefore how well he acquits himself in this vast enterprise, of so great concern to the Christian World. His Argument from Scripture is this; there are other *expressions in Scripture* which are taken figuratively, therefore this must be so taken. Out of the *innumerable like expressions in Holy Scripture*, as he is pleased to term them, he citeth two very different sorts: The first are barely figurative, such as are used in ordinary human discourse as well as Scripture, without preparing of the mind of the Hearer beforehand, that he may receive them. Then he compares the words of our Lords Institution to *a Dream or Vision of the Night*, that was to be interpreted, which indeed hath something more of resemblance than the former expressions which he alledgeth; because it being known that the things which are represented in Dreams and Visions are not real but imaginary; yet since they are sometimes considered as representing real things, that are to come to pass, they are of the nature of Signs of Institution, and so may come nearer to the Case
in

Transubstantiation Defended.

in hand. But he seems to be soon weary of these resemblances, which being so different in nature, one from the other, are not like to agree to the same third thing, the *Sacrament*. Then he flies from Scripture to *Justin Martyr's* Testimony concerning the ancient *form* of the Passover used by the *Jews*. Yet he knows not whether he should stick to this expression, which is Sacrificial or Sacramental, and so most likely to resemble the Sacramental, about which he argues; or the former, which are not so. For he begins his Periods thus: *Whether we consider the like expressions in Scripture, as where our Saviour saith, &c. or, whether we compare these words with the ancient form of the Passover*: And I am sure these are not of a like nature with the other. Surely there is no Man of common Sense that can admit of such a sort of Proof as this, from one Author that so fluctuates in his judgment, since it hath the visible Character of Falshood in its very Front, and condemns the Real Presence of Christs Body, in a proper Sense, which was never openly contested in Christs Church till *Berengarius's* time, (nor so much as privately, till the time of *Paschasius*, unless by those that denied the Incarnation of our Lord it self) as well as the more explicit Sense, *Transubstantiation*, against the Authority of all the Doctors of the Catholic Church and its constant Tradition for so many Ages. But lest any one should be deceived with such a pretended *Evidence* from Scripture; I shall shew plainly that never a one of these sorts of expressions, suits with this of our Saviours in Scripture, and that therefore most certainly all of them do not.

The first, that are mentioned, are barely figurative expressions; as where our Saviour saith, *I am the Door, and the true Vine* (and the Church of Rome may triumph in this, that our Lord saith, that *his Flesh is truly Meat* ἀληθὺς ἑσώτης, *Joh. 6. 55.*) the Church is said to be Christs Body, and Christ is termed a Rock in a Spiritual Sense, 1 Cor. 10. 4. *They drank of that Spiritual Rock which followed them, and that which before is called a Spiritual Rock, without doubt was Christ.* Though the Author is pleas'd to leave out the

the

the word *Spiritual*, but I would advise him to have a care of that Curse which justly falls upon those that diminish from Holy Scripture, to favour a Party. That I may the better demonstrate the dissimilitude of these, and the other figurative expressions, which are by the Author alledged out of Holy Scripture, to that proper one of our Lord, *This is my Body*; I shall lay down these Rules to distinguish them by.

1. The desire which Men have to make themselves to be understood, and to imprint lively Ideas of that which they conceive themselves, in the minds of others, and of retaining them the better, doth naturally incline them to search for Comparisons and Resemblances, which may render the Idea that they would form, the more sensible. The reason of which is, because things of Sense do most affect the mind, and make the deepest and most lasting impressions; and this Rule is the ground of most metaphorical expressions, which are of so great use and ornament in human discourse.

Rules to judge of
Metaphorical
expressions by.

2. Hence it follows, that the qualities of the thing, which we affirm of another in this figurative way, should be more plain and familiar to us, or at least fully as plain as the thing of which we affirm it, otherwise it will not be fit to work the effect before mentioned.

3. The resemblance lies usually in but one, or but some few, at the most, of those qualities, wherein the thing that is affirmed is like to that thing whereof it is affirmed.

4. The inclination which Men naturally have to abridge their discourse, joined with the desire of imprinting things in the mind, by sensible Ideas, is the cause they ordinarily include these comparisons in the same words that the things they are compar'd to are express'd by, suppressing all the terms of relation, and expressing them, as if the things of which they speak, were really those things which they use as Images to express them the more clearly by: Thus we find it said, Gen. 49. 9. *Judah is a Lions Whelp.* v. 22. *Joseph is a fruitful Bough.* Hos. 10. 1. *Israel is an empty Vine.*

5. The thing from which the resemblance is taken is generally

Transubstantiation Defended.

generally more ignoble, and of an inferior order to that of which it is affirmed, as being more sensible ; for the objects of Sense are inferior to those of pure Understanding ; and heavenly things are of that exalted nature, that they cannot be compared to any thing that is above them.

6. Therefore the terms are not convertible (for altho' we call a Man of courage a Lion, by reason of the resemblance of the quality of boldness, yet we term not a Lion a Man.) And the reason of this is, because in the Subject is understood the whole Idea of the thing expressed ; but in the Predicate but some qualities.

7. Altho' for the explaining a barely metaphorical expression, a Parable or a Dream, that which is properly the Predicate be put in the place of the Subject, yet it is rarely so used but upon such like occasions as this; and then too it doth not lose its nature, but is the Predicate still ; for we are not to mind the position of the words to find out the Predicate, but the sense of the Proposition: As in that Proposition of our Lord, *Job. 6. 33. The Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven*, he which cometh down from Heaven, is the Subject, altho' put in the place of the Predicate, as is plain : So that, here the thing which is signified or resembled, is always the Subject, and the thing signifying or resembling the Predicate.

8. In Metaphors you cannot punctually design the thing to which another is resembled by pointing to it, or, using a pronoun Demonstrative ; as for instance, tho' Christ in Scripture be called a Way, and a Shepherd, yet you cannot say, Christ is *this* Way, pointing to some particular Way, nor Christ is *this* Shepherd, demonstrating some particular Man that is a Shepherd; nor on the other hand that *this* Way is Christ, *this* Shepherd is Christ.

9. None ever can pretend, that after a mere Metaphorical Allusion in way of Doctrine, a real Vertue should be imparted by receiving that thing to which another is compared: As when Christ calls himself a *Vine* in Scripture, that the eating of the fruit of the Vine should have conveyed Christs Blessing and Vertue.

It

It will be easie to discern the great disparity between the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, and those Metaphorical ones which the Author here alledgeth, by comparing them together, and examining them by the foregoing Rules. Our Saviour calleth himself a *Door*, because of the natural resemblance, which the Mind, casting about for the meaning of this expression, immediatly, without any difficulty finds, and he himself declares; for as by a *Door* we enter into the House, so by Christ we enter into Heaven; for through him the way is opened: *A Vine*, in like manner, because from him all true Believers as Branches receive their nourishment and growth in Grace, by which they are enabled to bear Fruit: *A Rock*, because from him the Fountain of Living Waters doth Spring: The Church his *Body*, because of the Union of the Members of his Body one with another, and of all with the Head, and the mutual assistance which they afford each to other, in which the Spiritual Body Resembles a Natural Body.

The Application of the foregoing Rules: By which it appears, that those merely Metaphorical expressions of our Saviours being a *Door*, a *Vine*, &c. are not at all like to the Form of Consecration, *This is my Body*.

(a) By these sensible and easie comparisons the Idea of the thing which our Saviour expresses, by them, is more lively imprinted in our Minds, and by this means the Memory the better retains them: (b) These do explain the things of which they are affirmed, and render them the more familiar to us; (c) and yet the Resemblance lies in but one, or, at the most but some few of the qualities; (d) the terms of relation are suppressed in the first proposal of these expressions, altho' explained afterwards, and one word includes the Comparison. It is otherwise in the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, supposing that by the Term, *This*, Bread is meant in the Sacramentarian Sense; (1) for the *Body* of Christ is not a fit thing to Resemble *Bread* by, the notion of *Bread* is not the more sensibly imprinted, by comparing *Christs Body* with it, neither doth the Memory by this means the better retain it; the applying the Idea of *Christs Body* (2) to *Bread* doth not render the nature of *Bread* more familiar, but on the contrary more abstruse and difficult to apprehend, (3) the Resemblance lies in none of the visible qualities, (4) the Terms of Relation

(a) See Rule 1.

(b) See Rule 2.

(c) See Rule 3.

(d) See Rule 4.

Contrary to R. r.

R. 1.

R. 3.

R. 4.

lation are not suppressed, for no such Relation can be conceived. Now to proceed; (e) In the former expressions, the things which are expressed, ~~are~~ of an Inferior nature to the things of which they are expressed, yet more sensible; therefore the Terms are not convertible:

(f) See Rules 7, 8. (f) For altho' it be said *Christ is the Door*, yet we cannot say of any particular *Door*, that it is *Christ*; altho' it is affirmed that *Christ is the true Vine*, yet we cannot say of any *Vine* pointing to it, that it is *Christ*; altho' he be called a *Rock*, yet we cannot say, designing some particular *Rock*, that *this Rock* is *Christ*: For in that Proposition, *the Rock was Christ*, we must not regard the order of the words, but the Sense of the Proposition to find out the Subject and the Predicate; so that when it was said, *the Rock was Christ*, the meaning is, *Christ* was Typified by that *Rock*, or *Christ* was like that *Rock*, unless we understand, as we ought to do from the preceding words of the Apostle, by the Term *Rock*, a *Spiritual Rock*, and so he was really such a *Rock*, and not Typically so; Altho' it be said, that *the Church is the Body of Christ*, yet we cannot affirm of the natural *Body of Christ*, that it is his *Church*. It is (g) otherwise

(g) Contrary to
R. 5, 6, 7, 8.

in the expression of our Lord: For the Predicate is here of the same nature with the Subject, if understood in the Sense of Catholics; it is of a Superior nature, if understood in the Sense of our Adversaries; the Terms, if taken in the former Sense are convertible; for as it was said by Christ, *This is my Body*, meaning the thing that was contained under the visible Species, so it might be affirmed of the same Body, that it was, *this*; which was thus contained: In the latter Sense we may as well affirm, that the *Body of Christ* was *Bread*, as that *Bread* was the *Body of Christ*, for indeed neither of these could be truly affirmed, since these Propositions, in this Sense, would be false, and absurd, there being no sensible Resemblance, nor no identity, for the Terms are incompatible: And therefore we need not consider of the Sense of them, to find out which is the Subject, and which the Predicate, for there is no true Sense here to be found, nor no such relation, because

our

our Lord had not declared the *Bread* to be a sign of Institution, before he spoke these words, *This is my Body*, and the *Bread* was not naturally a sign of his *Body*; as shall be shewed in the ensuing Discourse.

Well, but tho' the Proposition seem so very absurd in this Sense, where the *Body of Christ* is taken for the Predicate, or thing by which Bread is resembled; yet if *This*, that is, the *Bread* shew'd in *Christ's* Hands, according to our Adversaries, be taken for the Predicate, meaning by the Proposition, *This is my Body*, that This *Bread* is a Resemblance of *my Body*, they will say perhaps it is not so: But I shall prove it to be so, for these Reasons.

1. Because if the words were to be so understood, then if the Predicate were restored to its proper place, the Sense would be clear and obvious, as in that Proposition of our Lord; Joh. 6. 33. *The Bread of God is he which cometh down from Heaven*; when we change the position of the words, and say, *He which cometh down from Heaven is the Bread of God*; for now the Subject and Predicate have their proper places; But it is otherwise in this Proposition, *This is my Body*, meaning by, *This*, the *Bread* then Demonstrated; for you cannot say, without absurdity, that the *Body of Christ* is this *Bread*, meaning some particular *Bread*. 2. In Metaphorical expressions the Predicate is not put in the place of the Subject at the first proposal of the Similitude, Parable, or the like; but afterwards when the Explanation is made, according to the Sixth and Seventh Rules before mentioned. Thus it was said by our Lord, Matt. 13. 24. *The Kingdom of Heaven*, (That is, Christ the Son of Man setting forth, and obtaining this Kingdom for us) *is likened to a Man that Sowed good Seed in his Field*; before he would say by way of Explication, Ver. 37. *He that Sowed the good Seed is the Son of Man*, and when he had proposed the rest of the Parable unto them; then, by way of Explication, it also follows; *The Field is the World: The good Seed are the Children of the Kingdom, but the Tares are the Children of the wicked one*: Which method is also used in the other

See Rule 7.

F 2

Parables

Transubstantiation Defended.

See Rule 8.

Parables of Scripture, that are Explained. 3. The Predicate or thing Resembling in these Metaphors, whether it be put in the place of the Subject, or in it's own, is never particularised by a Pronoun Demonstrative: For our Lord doth not say, Pointing to any *Husband-man*, *This* is the Son of *Man*; or of a *Field* that he was in, *This* is the *World*; or of any good *Grains of Corn*, that he sees Sown, *These* are the *Children of the Kingdom*: So likewise it would have been improper to have said, *This* my *Body* is *Bread*; or *This Bread* is *my Body*.

A Metaphor
conveys no Spi-
ritual vertue.
See Rule 9.

Lastly, Those of the English Church do pretend from these words of Christ, *This is my Body*, that there is some Spiritual Blessing or Vertue of *Christs Body* (tho' the *Body* it self be not there) annexed to the Elements, or their Reception, which, if they were but a mere Metaphorical expression, like the rest mentioned by the Author, it is highly unreasonable to conclude. Therefore for this reason, as also for all the disparities before shewed, we may truly affirm, that there is no such Resemblance, as the Author pretends, between the foregoing expressions alledged out of Scripture, where our Saviour is call'd a *Vine*, a *Door*, &c. And that of our Lord's Institution, *This is my Body*. I shall now proceed to examin the next that are Cited, which are of a very different nature from the former.

Pharaohs Dream
doth not resem-
ble the Sacred
words of Consec-
ration, *This* is
my Body.

As when *Joseph* Expounding *Pharaohs Dream* to him, Gen. 41. 26. says, *the Seven good Kine are Seven Years, and the Seven good Ears of Corn, are Seven Years*: Which expressions, as also that out of *Justin Martyr* that follows, the Author compares to the words of *Christs Institution*. Now, that I may shew, that there is no reason that our Lords words should be taken in the Figurative Sense of these expressions, but contrarywise in a proper Sense, I shall lay down these distinctions and Rules to shew the disparity by.

Distinctions and
Rules for the
following Dis-
course of the
nature of signs.

Signs are either Naturally so, as black Clouds are a Sign of Rain, Smoak is a Sign of Fire; or else so, only by Institution and agreement; concerning which latter, I again.

gain distinguish. That of Signs of Institution, some have so much of Natural Resemblance, as that they may fitly be chosen to signify and represent, altho' not enough to exhibit the Idea of the thing upon the bare sight or mentioning, which afterwards by Institution they are to signify unto us (Thus a living Creature Sacrificed Typifies, or signifies Christ Crucified upon the Cross;) and some have not; Thus the word *Moses* doth signify such a Man; where there is no Natural Resemblance between these Letters compounded into a word, and the person Represented by them, but this depends upon mere Institution and compact amongst Men.

2. All rational Discourse used amongst Men is founded upon the imperfect penetration, at least, into the Minds of those with whom we discourse, and the presumed Knowledge of them. For we regulate our Speech, according to the apprehension that we believe those, with whom we converse, have of it. If we believe Mens Minds to be prepared to understand our Discourse, then we utter it to them; if they are not able as yet to perceive what we say, then we must either prepare them beforehand, or else give a distinct and formal explication of our words, soon after we have uttered them, otherwise we abuse our Auditors. From whence it follows,

3. That that sort of improper Discourse, wherein we give the Sign the name of the thing signified, or to the thing signified the name of the Sign, being very rare, to make it intelligible, it is required, 1. That the Sign be plainly Instituted. 2. It must be justly presumed, that those to whom we speak, regard the thing as a Sign, or else we ought to advertise them, that we intend to use it as so. For there is no example either in Scripture or ordinary human Discourse of a like expression to this of our *Lords*, by which, at the very first constituting any thing into a Sign, it is called the thing signified, without preparing the minds of the Auditors to understand it so. To apply these Rules to the case in hand, we must observe, that this Dream or Vision of *Pharaohs* was a Sign of Institution,

Application of
the foregoing
Rules and
Distinctions.

it

Transubstantiation Defended.

it having been appointed by God to signifie something to him: Again, indeed this Sign had some sort of fitness, in it's own nature, to be made a Sign of what it was to represent, even more than *Bread* hath to represent *Christ's Body*, yet it could not exhibit to *Pharaoh's Mind* the thing which it was to signifie without some explicit interpretation of good Authority, and it was so obscure a Sign, that none of all his Magicians could give it. Therefore *Pharaoh* proposes this to *Joseph* as a *Dream*, Gen. 41. v. 22. Adverting him of what he saw in a *Dream*; which *Joseph* undertaking to Interpret, *Pharaoh* could not but consider his words as an Interpretation of this Sign of Institution; therefore by the Second, and Third Rules, beforementioned, it was very rational for him to put the Predicate in the place of the Subject, the Sign for the thing signified, by saying, *the Seven good Kine are Seven Years, and the Seven good Ears of Corn are Seven Years, that is, they signified or represented Seven Years of Plenty; since it is very well known that in the Hebrew Language things are commonly said to be that which they do signifie and represent:* But then it must be known beforehand, that they do only signifie and represent; otherwise it cannot be understood when they only express a Resemblance, and when Identity. On the contrary, if in the expression of our Lord, *This is my Body*, the *Bread* had been a Sign of Institution, tho' it have some remote resemblance, yet since it could not of it self, before plain positive Institution, bring the Idea of the thing, supposed to be represented, to the Mind, therefore since there was no such foregoing Institution, or action to prepare the Minds of the Apostles to consider it as so, and these words of Christ are no explication of a Sign of Institution, but must be the Original Institution it self of a Sign, if any had been here made, and the Apostles were no ways advertised before-hand to consider the Bread as a Sign; since the Predicate therefore could not rightly here be put in the place of the Subject, much less a Pronoun Demonstrative be used according to a former Rule; therefore these words, *This is my Body*, according

ding to the known Rules of human Discourse, which it were Blasphemy to say our Lord would swerve from, so as to speak absurdly, do signifie that, That was his *Real Body* which he held in his hands, and not a *Sign* only of his *Body*, as our Adversaries falsely pretend. *Neither do I believe, that any sensible man, who had never heard before of this figurative Sense, which the Author and Sacramentarians have so often inculcated into their Followers, as to make them prejudiced in the Case, would upon reading the Institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel, or if they had heard Christ speak the words, ever have imagined that by these words, This is my Body, no more was to be understood, than that, this, which Christ held in his hands was only a Sign of his Body, any more than our Saviours Apostles and Disciples could be made to understand the like words, John 6. 51, 52. I am the living Bread that came down from Heaven. And the Bread that I will give is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world (the Jews therefore strove amongst themselves saying, how can this Man give us his Flesh to eat?) in that Sense: But would have understood his meaning to have been thus: This which hath the outward appearance of Bread is really my Body, This which hath the resemblance of Wine is my Blood. Not as the Author fallaciously proposeth the meaning, This Bread signifies my Body, this Cup signifies my Blood, But that he should enjoyn them to do that which they then saw him do, That is, offer up, hereafter, his Real Body and Blood, under the Species of Bread and Wine, by way of an unbloody Sacrifice, for a Memorial of that Bloody one of his Body and Blood, which he was soon after to offer up upon the Cross. And in this great Mystery, a true Christian, one that hath an humble Soul rightly disposed for the Belief of our Lords words, as St. Augustin had, who speaking of our Lord, saith: Christ was carried in his own hands, when recommending to them his very Body, he saith, This is my Body. For he carried that Body in his hands; such a one I say, can readily believe that our Saviour did properly, and really hold himself in his hand, and give away himself, but not from himself with*

Ferebatur Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans ipsum corpus suum, ait, hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis. Aug. Comment. in Ps. 33.

Transubstantiation Defended.

his own hands; by reason of the natural Connection and Concomitance which his Sacred Soul and Divinity have with his *Body* and *Blood*, under the visible Species of *Bread* and *Wine*.

DISCOURSE.

Or whether we compare these words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews from Ezra's time, as (n) Justin Martyr tells us, τὸ πᾶχα ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταφυγὴ ἡμῶν, this Passover is our Saviour and our refuge: Not that they believed the Paschal Lamb to be substantially changed either into God their Saviour who delivered them out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Messias the Saviour whom they expected and who was signified by it: But this Lamb which they did eat, did represent to them and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in Egypt, when by the slaying of a Lamb and sprinkling the Blood of it upon their Doors their first-born were passed over and spared; and did likewise foreshew the Salvation of the Messias, the Lamb of God that was to take away the Sins of the World.

(n) Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 297. Edit. Paris, 1639.

ANSWER.

The Analogy which the words of Institution, *This is my Body*, might have to the Paschal form in Scripture, or to those phrases cited from *Esdra*, or any of the *Rabins*, do not prove that Christ's words here, are to be taken figuratively and not in a proper Sense.

The Author having tried several very different sorts of expressions in Holy Scripture, with which he hath offer'd to compare the words of our Lord's Institution, seeming not at all to be satisfied in his Mind, about their Analogy to these, yet not able to discover any of a nearer resemblance, being at a great loss, hath recourse to the Authority of an Ancient Father, and now he will either find one or make one, if he can, for his purpose. For considering that our Saviour had just before this Institution celebrated the Passover, it might seem reasonable to conclude, that he should now imitate that manner of speaking which he used so very lately. Therefore it is but finding, or coyning a Paschal Form of Institution, suitable to the saying

saying of our Lord, *This is my Body*, and he may think his work is done. What pity it is, that he could not discover one in all the Scripture or Fathers for his purpose, but that he must be forc't to use such pitiful Sophistry as he here doth to impose upon his Reader in this manner? *Whether*, saith he, *we compare these words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews from Ezra's time, as Justin Martyr tells us; But where doth he tell us so? There's not a word said, by him, that, that which is cited here, was an Ancient Form of the Passover, or that it was used by the Jews from Ezra's time; this is a pure Invention of the Authors, which you will be fully convinced of, by consulting Justin Martyr himself, about the words, which were by the Jews left out of those Interpretations of Ezra's, or Esdras's, wherein he expounds the Law of the Passover, and which run thus: * Esdras said to the People, This Passover, - Sacrifice is our Saviour and our Refuge, but if you think, and it enter into your Heart to conceive, that we render him abject in a Sign, and afterwards place our hope in him, let not this place be forsaken for ever, saith the Lord of Hosts, and if you do not believe his words, nor hearken to his Preaching, you will be had in derision by all Nations. This is all that the Father saith of the matter, where we find not one word said, of what the Author cites, as being an Ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews, but only that, in these words, Esdras expounded the Law of the Passover to the People; neither is here the least mention made of it's being used by the Jews from Esdras's time, all this is the mere Fiction of our Author, who did not consider, that, Holy Scripture, and Learned Authors amongst his own party, give us an account of the Paschal Forms that were used, which are quite different from this, which no Author gives us as one but himself. For *Exod. 12. 11.* God saith, *It is the Lord's Passover*, or more explicitly, *Ver. 26. 27.* *It shall come to pass, when your Children shall say unto you, what mean you by this service? That ye shall say, it is the Sacrifice of the Lord's Passover.* And *Ver. 13.**

* Τὸ τοῦ Παλ-
χα ὁ σωτὴρ
ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ κα-
ταφυγὴ ἡμῶν,
καὶ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν
ἀναβῆναι
ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὴν
καρδίαν, ὅτι
μέλλομεν
αὐτὸν ταπει-
νῶν ἐν σημεῖω,
καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα
ἐλπίσωμεν
ἐπ' αὐτὸν καὶ
μὴ ἐξημαρθῆναι ὁ
πόσιος ἔστις
εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα
αἰῶνος, λέγει
ὁ θεὸς τῶν
δυνάμεων εἰς
τὸ μὴ ποιεῖν
σημεῖον καὶ
ἐπιστάσει τὴν
κηνύχματος
αὐτοῦ, ἐσέσθαι
ἐπὶ χάριμα
τοῖς ἐθνεσίν.

G

It

Transubstantiation Defended.

It is said, *the Blood shall be to you for a Token, or Sign, and when I see the Blood I will pass over you.* And Dr. Hammond tells us that the Lamb drest in the Paschal Supper, and set upon the Table, was called, *The Body of the Passover, or the Body of the Paschal Lamb*, (not the Body of Christ, of which, notwithstanding, it was a Sign and Type) another Paschal Form he tells us, was: *This is the Bread of Affliction*, referring to the unleavened Bread: Which Forms are nothing like this Expository Phrase of *Esdra*s cited by *Justin Martyr*. Well, but altho' this be not a *Paschal Form*, yet it is a certain expression which *Esdra*s used concerning the Passover, and I shall now shew so great a disparity between it, as so considered, and that of our Lords Institution, as will plainly discover how falsely it is urged here to prove, that our Lords words are Metaphorical. For, 1. These words were true in a proper Sense, which our Adversaries will not allow Christs to be: The, *Passover was a Saviour or Salvation* (*σωτήρ* for *σωτηρία* a way of speaking used by other Authors and explained in the following word) *and a Refuge* to the Jews, in a strict Sense, God having appointed it as a means and Instrumental cause at least of their deliverance, at it's first Institution, and it was a Salvation and Refuge to those who afterwards used it aright. Why then may we not likewise conclude from hence, that, that which Christ gave to his Disciples, when he said, *This is my Body*, was really his *Body*? 2. All the Jews, who had a right understanding of things, considered the *Sacrifices*, that were offered as *Types* of Christ the *Messias*, and this of the Passover more signally as so, as appears from this Authority of *Esdra*s out of *Justin Martyr*, in these words, *If you think that we render him about in this Sign, and afterwards place our hope in him*; Therefore it was not at all unreasonable to Attribute the thing signified to that which they regarded in their minds as a *Sign*, by saying, *This Passover Sacrifice is our Saviour and our Refuge*: Not that they could have any ground from hence to believe the *Paschal Lamb* to be substantially changed, either into
God

God their Saviour, who delivered them out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Messias the Saviour, whom they expected, and who was signified by it: But this Lamb which they did Eat, being known to be a Sign of Institution, did represent to them, and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in Egypt, when by the slaying of a Lamb, and sprinkling the Blood of it upon their Doors, their first-born were passed over and spared; and did likewise foreshew the Salvation of the Messias, the Lamb of God that was to take away the sins of the World. Now the Bread, and Wine, not having been at all discovered to be such Signs of our Saviours Body and Blood, to the Disciples, nor consequently considered as so, it was against the Rules of human discourse, to say they were his Body and Blood, if no more was meant, than that they were Signs of them; and as absurd, as for Moses before the formal Institution of the Paschal Sacrifice, recited at large in Exod. 12. to have said to the People upon Sacrificing a Lamb, *This is the Lords Passover.* Or *This Passover is your Saviour.* For it was to be known and considered as a Passover Sacrifice, and as a Type of the Messias, before he could reasonably have affirmed thus of it. 3. The Jewish Passover was a Type of this Sacrament, and so it is generally acknowledged by the * Fathers to be; now that there should be a Sign of a Sign only, a Type of that, which it self was but a Type, Instituted by Christ, is very unreasonable to imagin; especially since we do not now live under a Law of Shadows and Figures, but of Verity and Substance.

* See in their Authorities, *infra.*

Since, therefore, the Paschal Lamb was really, and in a proper Sense the Sacrifice of the Lords Passover according to that true Paschal Form in * Holy Scripture, because a true Paschal Sacrifice was offered by the Jews as well for a grateful acknowledgment of their past benefit, as of one that was certainly to come; since this Passover Sacrifice was really a Saviour, or Salvation to the Jews, as well as a Type of the Messias; since the Lamb drest in the Paschal Supper, was not only call'd, but really was, the Body of

* Exod. 12. 27.

Transubstantiation Defended.

the Passover Sacrifice, or Paschal Lamb, according to the foremention'd expressious of *Esdra*s, and the Rabins, which, notwithstanding we can by no means allow to be Paschal Forms of constant usage, since they so vary from one another; much less of Divine Institution, because no such are used in Holy Scripture; since the Bread which the Jews Eat, when they used that Phrase, *This is the Bread of Affliction*, was Real Bread; and all that Eat this Bread, as they ought to do, were really afflicted, when they seriously consider'd what their * Fathers suffer'd in *Egypt*; because they also, for their own sins, deserv'd to suffer as much, this Bread also being the same *which* their Fathers did Eat, viz. unleavened Bread: Surely none can be so hard of belief, as to imagin, after serious consideration, that there was less of truth and reality in our Lords words, *This is my Body*, in which, as is not improbable, he might imitate some of these Phrases, than there was even in these expressions which were used under the Law, of Types and Shadows. And to shew the Analogy the more perfectly, and not to represent it partially, as our * Adversaries do, we are further to consider, That as the Bread of Affliction, which was yearly Eaten by the Jews at the time of the Paschal Solemnity, was really Bread, and of the same kind with that which their Fathers did Eat in *Egypt*; and was also a *Memorial* of the first Bread of this kind, which their Fathers did Eat; As the Paschal Lamb that was yearly drest, and really Eaten, was the Real Body of the Passover Sacrifice thus yearly offer'd, and was also to put the Jews in mind of the first deliverance wrought upon the first Paschal Offering; so Christians, when they renew the Sacrifice of Eucharist, feed upon Christs Real Body, which is the Antitype of the Paschal Lamb, and at the same time * Remember that first Oblation which Christ made of the same Body, altho' in a different manner upon the Cross.

* *Deut.* 16. 3.

* *Vid.* A Discourse of the Holy Eucharist. Edit. A. 1687. p. 12.

* *Vid.* Exposition of the words, Do this in remembrance of me, *infra*.

DIS-

DISCOURSE.

And nothing is more common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the Sign. As the delivery of a Deed or Writing under hand and Seal is call'd a conveyance or making over of such an Estate, and it is really so; not the delivery of mere Wax and Parchment, but the conveyance of a Real Estate; as truly and really to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the very material Houses and Lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my Hands: In like manner the names of the things themselves made over to us in the new Covenant of the Gospel between God and Man, are given to the Signs and Seals of that Covenant. By Baptism Christians are said to be made partakers of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6. 4. And by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to Communicate or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and of his Blood which was shed for us, that is, of the real benefits of his Death and Passion. And thus St. Paul speaks of this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16. The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? But still it is Bread, and he still calls it so, v. 17. For we being many are one Bread and one Body; for we are partakers of that one Bread. The Church of Rome might, if they pleased, as well argue from hence, that all Christians are substantially changed, first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ by their participation of the Sacrament, because they are said thereby to be one Bread and one Body. And the same Apostle in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Consecration of the Elements, still calls them the Bread and the Cup, in three verses together, As often as ye Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup, v. 26. Whosoever shall Eat this Bread, and Drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, v. 27. But let a Man examin himself, and so let him Eat of this Bread and Drink of that Cup, v. 28. And our Saviour himself when he had said, this

Transubstantiation Defended.

* *Matth. 26. 29.*

this is my Blood of the New Testament, *immediately adds,*
 * but I say unto you, I will not henceforth Drink of this
 fruit of the Vine, until I Drink it new with you in my
 Father's Kingdom, *that is, not till after his Resurrection,*
which was the first step of his Exaltation into the Kingdom,
given him by his Father, when the Scripture tells us he did
Eat and Drink with his Disciples. But that which I observe
from our Saviour's words is, that after the Consecration of
the Cup and the delivering of it to his Disciples to Drink of
it, he tells them that he would thenceforth Drink no more of
the fruit of the Vine, which he had now Drank with them, till
after his Resurrection. From whence it is plain that it was
the fruit of the Vine, Real Wine, which our Saviour Drank
of and Communicated to his Disciples in the Sacrament.

A N S W E R.

A Deed's being
 call'd a convey-
 ance doth not
 prove that the
 words *This is my*
Body, are not to
 be taken pro-
 perly.

Here, since neither the Authority of the Fathers, nor
 the Word of God can afford the Authors cause any relief,
 he at length flies to the Laws of Men, for it, where we
 shall see him immediately cast himself, and be non-suited
 at the very beginning of his Trial. He tells us, that *the*
delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is called
a Conveyance or making over of such an Estate, (that is, of a
 Title to such an Estate) *and that it really is so;* that we
 deny, unless there be possession also given, as I shall pre-
 sently shew. And yet what do we affirm more of Christs
 words in the Sacrament, *This is my Body which is given*
for you, &c. which we have, taken from his own
 mouth by the *Hands* of inspired Pen-men, *Sealed* by him-
 self with Miracles, and *delivered* to his Church, than that
 they are a *Conveyance, or making over* of his Sacred Body
 to us, and that they are *so really,* not only in Sign or
 Figure? He proceeds to tell us, That this *Delivery of a*
Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal, is not the Delivery
of mere Wax, and Parchment, but the conveyance of a Real
Estate, as truly and really to all effects and purposes of Law,
as if the material Houses and Lands themselves could be,
 and

and were actually delivered into my hands. Well, but we say that a *Deed* of Feoffment takes not effect to *all purposes of Law*, without Livery and Seisin, neither doth it convey an Estate without that, nor a Deed of Release neither, unless the Purchaser be put in Possession, before hand, by a Lease, and then too, not by the Common Law; but so necessary is Possession deemed for the through Conveyance of an Estate, that in case of absence from the Land or the like, the Law-makers have by a particular Statute necessarily provided to give Possession otherwise, for it is not necessary to the making a Man in Possession of an Estate, that he should hold his Land and House in his Arms, or stand always upon the Premises. But I hope the Author will not so far endeavor to invalidate the Common Assurance of the Nation, as to maintain, that because the Man hath *thus a Conveyance of a real Estate to all effects, and purposes of Law*, therefore he must not enter upon it, dwell in the House, Reap the Fruits of the ground, and nourish himself therewith, I imagin the Purchaser will not be put off so. In like manner, the words of Christ delivered, as his Act and Deed, by the Priest his Substitute, in the Consecration of the Sacrament for the use of those that are to Communicate, is not the *bare delivery* of so many Words only, but the *making over of a real Title* to them, to the thing which is meant by them, that is, the Body of our Lord, *as truly and really to all effects, and purposes* of the Gospel, as if it actually hung upon the Cross before their Eyes, in that Form, and with the same configuration, and quality of parts as it once did. Shall they therefore be hindred from taking immediate Possession of what is thus made over to them? No, this were too great a Sacrilege against God, and violation of the property of a Christian. They shall receive Christs Body and Blood, that they may dwell in him and he in them. They shall partake of the Fruits of the Sacrament, as of a goodly Heritage of their own, since Christ hath given them a just Right and Title to it, and shall cherish their Souls and Bodies therewith to Immortality. Those who
are

are contented only to hear of, or to see this goodly Land, and not to go and possess it; Those who will leave their Fathers House the Catholic Church, and go abroad to feed upon Husks, and imaginary vertue, are the objects of our pity. So indeed there is a sort of a Fiction in Law, in the Authors way of conveyance, of a Tenant by Deed or Lease of possession, who notwithstanding hath nothing to do to enter upon the Estate, or enjoy it; if the Author be contented with such a Title only in the Sacrament, I am sorry for him. And thus the Similitude is reasonably applied, as for our Adversaries way, who saith, that *as the delivery of a Deed or Writing under Hand and Seal is call'd a Conveyance or making over of such an Estate*, (he should have prov'd that the Deed is called the Estate it self, and not only the Conveyance of an Estate, if he would have made this phrase any thing suitable to that of our Lord, *This is my Body*) *in like manner the names of the things themselves made over to us in the New Covenant of the Gospel between God and Man, are given to the Signs and Seals of the Covenant*; whereas there is no Analogy between these things, nor truth neither in this instance. It is just as if one should say, that *Tenterden Steeple* were like the *Goodwin Sands*. I confess, I have often admired with my self at this sort of Similitude, which Protestants are mighty big with, pretending to Illustrate their fond opinion about the Sacrament clearly hereby, which being examined, proves as you see, but a mere Tympany of the Brain.

Other Texts of
Scripture ex-
amin'd, and
prov'd, not at all
to favor the Au-
thors Sense.

The Author having before told us, that nothing is more Common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the Sign, proceeds now to give us examples of this out of Holy Scripture; by Baptism, saith he, *Christians are said to be partakers of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6. 4.* And so they really are, and their Bodies are his Temples: But since Baptism is the Sign, and the Holy Ghost the thing signified, according to him, why doth he not bring us one instance out of Scripture of Baptisms being called the *Holy Ghost*, as they pretend that Bread in the

the words of Institution is called *Christs Body*? For this which he hath brought of Baptism is no Example to his *Common Rule*: We may reasonably conclude, that if the Sacrament of Baptism had been so very like this of the Eucharist, as they would have it, it would have been Instituted in a like Form, but it is quite otherwise: For neither Water, nor Baptism it self are called in Holy Scripture the Holy Ghost, neither is there any Form of Consecration of the Element, delivered. Indeed, by the Sacrament of the Lords Supper we are also said to Communicate, or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and his Blood that was shed for us; but that is his Real Body and Blood together with all the real benefits of his Death and Passion, which do thereby accrue to us. And thus St. Paul speaks of this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16. The Cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? That is, after Consecration, it really is so; altho' the Apostle calls it Bread by a Metaphor (that being to our Souls what the ordinary Bread is to our Bodies, true nourishment) so also it is said that Aarons Rod devour'd the other Rods, Exod. 7. 12. altho' it was then become a Serpent, v. 10. That Water which was by our Lord converted into Wine is still called Water, Joh. 2. 9. The Angels are called Men, Gen. 19. 8. because they appeared in the shape of Men, according to the usual Language of Sense, very many instances of which are to be found: For our Saviour had fully instructed them before, that the Bread which he would give them was his flesh, Joh. 6. 51. The Apostle also saith again, v. 17. For we being many are one Bread, and one Body; for we are partakers of that one Bread, and that one Bread can signifie nothing here but the Body of Christ, which indeed is but one, altho' appearing in innumerable places of the World at the same, and at several times, because it is still animated by the same one Soul and Divinity of Christ; which cannot be said of the Bread in the Sacrament, if but mere Bread, for then it would

H

not

Transubstantiation Defended.

not be *one Bread* or Loaf, but *many*, and of several sorts, being received at very many places at the same time: And the true reason here, why they are called *one Bread* and *one Body* or Society of Christians, is, because they are all partakers of that *one Bread*, viz. the *Body of Christ*, and therefore also all inspired with the same Spirit. But, in the Authors Sense, it would be no reason, but they should rather have been many *Bodies*, because they did Eat of so many *Breads*: So that we see he hath still the same success, in bringing those Texts of Scripture to uphold his cause, which are the most pregnant proofs against him. He then proceeds to teach the Catholics how they might argue in his new way, from a *Sign* already Instituted and known as so, to an *Enigma*, or dark saying, taken from things of a disparate and really different nature, and of no acknowledg'd Resemblance, that is, from Chalk to Cheese; but they beg his Pardon for that. Well, but the same *Apostle*, in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the Consecration of the Elements, still calls them the *Bread* and the *Cup* in three verses together, as often as ye Eat *THIS* Bread, and Drink *THIS* Cup, v. 26. *Whosoever shall Eat THIS* Bread and Drink *THIS* Cup of the Lord unworthily, v. 27. But let a Man Examine himself, and so let him Eat of *THAT* Bread and Drink of *THAT* Cup, v. 28. It is true it was Bread Metaphorically, but it was still *this* Bread with an Emphasis, not such Bread as you ordinarily Eat, but the *Body of Christ*, which he told us was truly Meat, or Meat indeed, the true Bread from Heaven, *John* 6. 32. It was a Cup, but it was *this* Cup, that is, his Blood, which was truly Drink, or Drink indeed, as he also hath taught us, *John* 6. 55. and after examination, let the true Christian Eat of *that* Bread and Drink of *that* Cup, which will strengthen his Body and Soul both, much more than the ordinary Bread and Wine can his Body only. Our Saviour himself, when he had said, *This is my Blood of the New Testament*, immediately adds, but I say unto you, I will not henceforth Drink of this Fruit of the Vine (that is of the true Vine, as

our

Transubstantiation Defended.

51

our Lord is pleased to call himself,) or of that Wine, which by the Words of Benediction becomes my Blood, being Originally the Fruit of the Vine; (or possibly it may refer to the unconsecrated Wine that was left in the Vessels) *until I drink it new*, that is fresh and newly Consecrated again *with you in my Fathers Kingdom*, or after my Resurrection, as some, with the Author, interpret the place; but as others more generally, till I drink of that *new Wine* of another sort and nature, *in the Kingdom of my heavenly Father*, where *we shall drink of the River of his pleasures*, *Psal. 36. 8.* and therefore the Authors following observation is nothing worth. For after the Apostles were satisfied that they really drank the *Blood* of our Lord in this Sacrament, and fed upon his *Real Body*, it was an easy and familiar Metaphor to call them Bread and Wine, because the outward Species gave a sufficient hint, for the understanding of this Figurative Speech, suitable to the Language of Sense in the instances above mentioned, out of Scripture; and because there was true Spiritual nourishment conveyed to the faithful by the *Body* and *Blood* of our Saviour thus received, as there is Corporeal nourishment received by the Natural Bread and Wine, which we take for the refection of our Bodies.

DISCOURSE.

Besides, if we consider that he celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, it is impossible these words should be understood literally of the natural Body and Blood of Christ; because it was his Body broken and his Blood shed, which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand literally of his natural Body broken and his blood shed, then these words, this is my Body which is broken, and this is my Blood which is shed, could not be true, because his Body was then whole and unbroken, and his Blood not then shed; nor could it be a propitiatory Sacrifice (as they affirm this Sacrament to be) unless they will say that Propitiation was made before Christ suffered: And it is likewise impossible that the Disciples should understand these words literally, be-

Transubstantiation Defended.

cause they not only plainly saw that what he gave them was Bread and Wine, but they saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given; no his Body broken and this Blood shed, because they saw him alive at that very time and beheld his Body whole and unpierc'd; and therefore they could not understand these words literally: If they did, can we imagine that the Disciples, who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and objections, should make no difficulty of this matter? nor so much as ask our Saviour, how can these things be? that they should not tell him, we see this to be Bread and that to be Wine, and we see thy Body to be distinct from both; we see thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not shed.

From all which it must needs be very evident, to any man that will impartially consider things, how little reason there is to understand those words of our Saviour, this is my Body, and this is my Blood, in the sense of Transubstantiation; nay on the contrary, that there is very great reason and an evident necessity to understand them otherwise. I proceed to shew,

A N S W E R.

Christ's body's being broken, and his blood being poured out for the remission of sins, before he was Crucified, proves the Sense of the Reality.

* Luke 22. 19, 20. This is my Body, which is given for you, in the present tense. See also the words of Institution as recited by the other two Evangelists, all in the present tense.

Besides, if we consider that our Lord celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, it is impossible that these words should be understood otherwise than properly, of the real Body and Blood of Christ; because it was his Body broken, and his Blood poured out, which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand as figurative only of his natural Body broken, and his Blood shed, then these words, this is my Body which is broken, and this is my Blood which is shed, could not be true, because his natural, organized, and visible Body was then whole and unbroken, and its Blood not then shed; yet that very Body as broken in the Sacrament was said to be * then given for them, that very Blood as there poured out was said then to be poured out for the remission of sins: Therefore it was a propitiatory Sacrifice, although offered before, as well as after Christ had suffered, to Pay the full Price of our Redemption, because its whole nature did consist

consist in the relation which it had to the Sacrifice that was offered up for us upon the Cross, from which it received all its vertue: *It was* very possible therefore for *our Lords Disciples* to *understand these words* properly, because although they plainly saw that what he gave them had the Species of Bread and Wine, yet they believed him, when he said that it was his Body that was given for them, although *his Body* at the same time gave what was given; *his Body broken* and *his Blood* poured out for them, although they saw him alive at that very time, and beheld his Body whole and unpierced, because he had plainly told them so, who had the Words of eternal Life, and could not deceive them; and for this reason they could not but understand his words properly: Otherwise, can we imagine that the Disciples, who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and objections, if they could have conceiv'd that these words were to be understood in a parabolical or improper Sense, would not have desired an Explication of them of our Lord, as they did of other Parables, which were more easy to be understood, than these words, in such a Sense? nor so much as ask our Saviour, how can these things be? That they should not tell him, we see This to be Bread, and That to be Wine, and we see thy Body to be distinct from both; we see thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not shed; what therefore should be the meaning of these words? or that our Saviour the true Guid, and greatest Lover of Souls, or any of his Apostles after him, should never have given any Explanation of them?

I have already shewed, in answer to the Author, that the words of our Lord, *This is my Body*, could not, according to the Rules of Human Discourse, be taken Figuratively, so as to Signifie this is a Sign of my Body, unless the Apostles had bin before-hand prepared to understand them as so: There are no words Recorded by any of the Evangelists to dispose them to believe the words in such a sense, nor any indeed, that relate to the matter, unless it be some sayings of our Lord in the Sixth Chapter of Saint *Johns* Gospel, that were delivered before the Institution of the Eucharist, which I shall now consider.

c. 22. 19.

consider, for the further Clearing of the Point, as also those words of Saint *Luke*, *This do in remembrance of me*, used by our Lord, at the time of the Institution; and prove that none of these expressions do at all favor our Adversaries Figurative Sense, but the clean contrary.

The 6. of St. *John's* Gospel interpreted as relating to the Blessed Sacrament.

* From v. 9. to v. 15.

v. 22.

v. 25.

We Read in the Sixth Chapter of Saint *John's* Gospel, that our Saviour had prepared the minds of his Disciples before-hand, by two great Miracles, both which tended towards the strengthening of their Faith in the Sacred Eucharist; the *Former being a Figure of this Sacrament, since in it he multiplied *Five Loaves*, so as to make them feed *five thousand* persons, altho' the fragments which remained filled *twelve baskets*, and were more in quantity than the five Loaves were at the first; so that they needed not to doubt, but he could feed as many thousands as he pleas'd with his own precious Body, exhibited under the Species of Bread, in the blessed Sacrament, and yet his Body be still one and the same: The latter shewing them, that he could Convey his Body how and whither he pleased, which made them ask him, when they saw him on the other side the Sea, without taking Ship at the shore, *Rabbi, when camest thou hither?* Then he proceeds to instruct them in Three of the greatest Mysteries of Religion.

1. His *Incarnation*, or coming down from Heaven, and taking Human Flesh upon him; from *verse 27.* where he also gives them a hint of the *blessed Sacrament*, that meat that perisheth not, to v. 51. 2. The Real Presence of his Body, and Manducation thereof, in the Sacrament (which wonderful Presence there, the Fathers did ever compare to the *Incarnation* it self) from v. 51, to v. 59. 3. The *Ascension* is mentioned, to Prove the two former Mysteries. v. 62.

Our Saviour, having styled himself the *Bread of Life*, towards the beginning of the Discourse of the *Incarnation*, v. 33, and 35. after some Explication made of this, Repeats it again twice, v. 49, and 51. to inculcate it the better into his Disciples minds: And then instructs them how they should be partakers of *this Bread*; not by believing only

only, that the Son of God came down from Heaven, and was made Man, taking upon him Human Flesh, but by feeding upon his Flesh in the Sacrament, which being a deep Mystery, that they might not doubt of the truth of it, he explains to them what he meant, when he said. *v. 51. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven, if any man eat of me, he shall live for ever*; not by telling them, that by *this Bread* is meant the Doctrin, which he taught, or that by, *eating this Bread*, is to be understood, the believing of this Doctrin, in a Metaphorical or Parabolical Sense, as the Socinians, and Sacramentarians fondly imagin; or in like manner as he Explained the Parable of the Sower that *Sowed good Seed*, telling them that *the Field is the World, the good Seed are the Children of the Kingdom*; or as when he had said, *I have meat to eat which ye know not of*, he explained himself by saying, *my Meat is to do the Will of him that sent me*, putting the Predicate in the place of the Subject in the manner before hinted, and saying, *the Bread is my Word or the Doctrin that I teach*; but quite otherwise, he assures them, that *the Bread, that he will give them, is his Flesh, which he promiseth to give for the life of the world*, and which, by an Elegant Metaphor, Christ calleth *Bread*, because it was to afford nourishment to the Soul and Body both, in a Spiritual manner in the Sacrament, as the ordinary Bread, was to nourish the Body, in a carnal manner, by way of corporeal digestion, out of the Sacrament: And there is no doubt but the Jews understood our Lord in a proper Sense, when they said, *v. 52. How can this Man give us his flesh to eat?* Our Saviour did not answer this doubt, by telling them, (as he easily might have done in the Sacramentarian way) that no more was meant but believing stedfastly in his Death, and applying to themselves the merits of it, and which Explication he would have certainly given them, then, or afterwards, by Himself or by his Disciples, if no more had bin meant than so; as he did in the case of Parables, less difficult to understand, than this would have bin, if it had bin by our Lord proposed as one; but proceeds, to deliver this profound
Mystery

vers. 33, 4, 5, 6,
8.

* αληθώς.

* see the Authorities, *infra*.

Mystery to them, in more exprefs words, using a vehement Assèveration to confirm the truth of it: *Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink his Blood, ye have no life in you: Whofo eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day: For my Flesh is * truly meat, my Blood is truly drink: He that eateth my Flesh, and drinketh my Blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him: As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: So he that eateth me, even he shall live by me: This is that Bread which came down from Heaven; not as your Fathers did eat Manna, and are Dead: He that eateth of this Bread shall live for ever: All which words, being used by our Lord, to clear the doubt, and answer that Question of the Jews, How can this man give us his Flesh to eat? I cannot imagin, how the Real Presence of Christs Body, and its Manducation in the Sacrament, could have bin more fully Asserted, in order to the disposing of his Disciples to believe the Sense of the Reality, when he should Institute his blessed Sacrament: And so the * Fathers interpret this place: And do not say, that the Manna, mentioned in the 38 verse, which was miraculously sent from Heaven, was a Type of ordinary Bread, made by the Hands of Men, and set upon the Table, which is of a far more Ignoble Nature and less Significant, than the Manna which thus came down from Heaven; but of the Real Body of Christ in the Sacrament, which was the true Bread from Heaven, that nourished to Immortality: After our Saviour had spoke thus to them, many of the Disciples themselves, to whom Christ did not think fit as yet to reveal the manner of feeding upon his Body in the Blessed Sacrament, thinking that he meant, that his Body was to be eaten in a gross manner, like the Capernaïtes, cried out, *this is a hard saying, who can hear it?* To whom, as well as to the Jews, who before are said to murmur at him; because he said, *I am the Bread which came down from Heaven; and that ask, how this Man could give them his Flesh to eat?* our Lord replies, *doth this offend you,* and then clears the Doctrins to them, as far as he judg'd convenient for the confirmation*

of

v. 41.
v. 52.

of such high Mysteries, about which they were to exercise a strong and a lively Faith, by saying thus, v. 62. *What and if ye shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* As if he should have said, if you do not yet believe, that the Son of Man came down from Heaven, yet when you see him ascend thither again, you will be more ready to believe, that it was really God who came down, took Flesh and dwelt amongst you; which Solution had relation chiefly to the former of the Mysteries, viz. his Incarnation; but withal insinuates, that such as believe not his words touching the holy Sacrament, and think it impossible for him, to give his Body to be eaten in so many places at once, being yet on Earth, would be much more Scandalized and Tempted after they saw or knew him to have Ascended into Heaven.

Therefore, to clear the latter Mystery, and Solve their doubt, who thought, like the *Capernaïtes*, that Christ was to have cut pieces of flesh from his body, and to have given them to be eaten; or that thought his Body to be that of a mere Man, he tells them, v. 63. *It is the Spirit that quickneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing*, that is, *the Flesh*, which he had told them before that they must eat, altho' not in the gross manner, without the Spirit *profiteth nothing*; not but that by the Spirit quickning it, it profits very much; Suitable to that of St. Paul. 1 Cor. 8. 1. *Knowledge puffeth up, but Charity edifieth*, that is, *Knowledge without Charity puffeth up*, altho' when *Charity* is joyned with it to enliven it, it *edifies*, and *Charity* it self edifieth by *Knowledge*: For if these words of Christ were to be taken in the Sense of the *Sacramentarians*, they would derogate no less from his Incarnation, Manhood and Death, than from the *Real Presence* of his Body in the Sacrament, in all which, without doubt, *the flesh profiteth* very much: Wherefore, our Lord goes on to tell them here, that, the words, *which he spake unto them, were Spirit and Life*, therefore not to be understood in the gross carnal Sense, before mentioned, which some of his Disciples took them in: For it is the use of the Scripture, to call Mans natural Sense, carnal Reasoning,
I and

Transubstantiation Defended.

and resisting, or not reaching to the belief of Supernatural Truths, *Flesh and Blood*, as, *Matth. 16. 17. Flesh and blood revealed not this to thee, &c.* but, *the words, that I speak unto you, they are Spirit and Life*; therefore, not to be carnally understood: But as by the Word of God, the World was Created, and Nature hath been, since, often chang'd; so, there is no doubt but Christ could, by it, change the Bread into his Body, as he did daily, by ordinary Natural Nutrition; but, * here in a supernatural way. Our Lord, therefore, said unto them, that their *Fathers did Eat Manna, in the Wilderness*, which was but a Type of this Heavenly Manna in the Sacrament, and yet they did *Spiritually* feed upon Christ the *Messias*; for it is said, *1 Cor. 10. 3, 4. That, they did all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and did all Drink the same Spiritual Drink; for they Drank of that Spiritual Rock that followed them, and that Rock was Christ, and yet they are Dead*, all of them a Temporal, some of them an Eternal Death also; and those of them which now live the Life Eternal, received this Life from the Son of God, who hath now given us the Antitype of that Manna which the Children of Israel did eat, *viz.* his own Body in the Sacrament, something of a far more excellent nature to feed upon, which will be to our Bodies, as well as to our Souls the Seed of Immortality, the Instrument, and Pledge of our Resurrection, Ascension, and Glorification. Yet as our Lord said to his Disciples, *there are some of you which believe not*, so we may say still of the Sacramentarians, who, notwithstanding all that Christ hath said, will admit of nothing but Signs, and Figures of imaginary vertue (whom nevertheless our Saviour hath no further instructed in any such easie Sense, as this, which might certainly have prevented their relapse as well as that of the Jews, his Disciples, and which if any such Sense had been to be admitted, would most certainly have been given) that they will not *believe* our Lord, and therefore they *go away* and will *walk no more with him* in the Communion of his Church.

Having, thus, made it to appear, that these words of
Christ.

* V. d. Gregorium
Nyssen *infra*.

Christs Institution, *This is my Body*, according to the Rules of human discourse, ought to be taken in a *proper* Sense, not only if considered in themselves, but especially if we regard what Christ hath said before touching the Sacrament, to dispose his Apostles thus to believe them ; it will necessarily follow , that those words also of the Institution, *This do in remembrance of me* (which relate chiefly to the Priests *Power* and *Duty*, as the other did to the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, and which St. Paul explains in these words, *As often as ye eat this Bread and drink this Cup ye shew the Lords Death till he come,*) ought not to be considered as a determination of the former words of the Institution in a Figurative Sense after the Sacramentarian way, but as a Declaration of one great end of the Sacrament, *viz.* The calling to mind, and setting forth of Christs Death till he comes, which is so far from being a Reason to prove, that Christs Body is not *Really* there, that on the contrary, this Commemoration and Annunciation is founded upon the Real Presence of Christs Sacrificed Body and Blood in this Sacrament ; since without this, it could not be done so effectually in Christs Church as now it is. For, as the Jews, in eating the Peace-Offerings, did remember that they were slain for them ; so by Offering here the Real Body of Christ, after the manner of an unbloody Sacrifice, we commemorate, and set forth, in this lively Exemplar, that Bloody Sacrifice, which Christ himself offered in a different manner upon the Cross, and receive the benefit thereof ; which we need not to question, since he gives us daily of this Victim to feed upon in the Blessed Sacrament, tho' without the horror of Blood. Shall Christians, then, under a pretence of Celebrating the Memory of the Passion in the Eucharist, evacuate Christs Institution, by taking away, from this pious Commemoration, that which, he out of his tender love, hath given us as most efficacious in it, for the good of our Bodies (into which this Sacrifice of Christs Body being received, Sanctifies them, and Consecrates and prepares them for a Glorious Resurrection)

The words, *This do in remembrance of me*, explained.

Transubstantiation Defended.

on) as well as for the good of our Souls? Ought we not to consider, that Jesus Christ doth, not only Command us to remember him, but likewise that we should do this by feeding upon his Sacramented Body and Blood, since he doth not say, that Bread and Wine should be a Memorial of his Body and Blood, but that in doing what he prescribes us to do, which is, that in Receiving his Body and Blood, we should remember him? And what more precious and lively Memorial could he give to his Disciples, and to all his beloved Children, what better Legacy could he bequeath them, at his departure out of the World, than this? If the the Primitive Christians were inflamed with Zeal and Devotion when they approached to the Monuments, where the Bodies only of Holy Martyrs, lay Intombed; more especially, if they could but touch any of their precious Reliquis, being by this means stirred up to a Pious Memorial, and imitation of their Holy Lives and Deaths; and therefore, did Religiously preserve the smallest pieces, and even the Nails of that Cross, upon which Christ suffered, Commemorating thereby his Holy Passion; how much more then should our Memory, and Love be excited, when we approach to the Holy Altar, and know, that we Receive there, tho' veiled under the Sacred Symbols, the very Body and Blood of our Lord, who Sacrificed himself for us, enlivened and quickened by his Grace and Spirit?

The Real vertue
of Christs Body
in the Sacrament,
cannot be proved
from Scripture
unless the Real
Presence of the
Body be admit-
ted.

I could now proceed to shew, for the further confirmation of what I have here alledged, from the Authority of Holy Scripture, that unless the words of St. *Johns* Gospel above mentioned, as also the words of our Saviours Institution, be taken in the Sense of the Reality or Transubstantiation, that there is no promise to be found, in Holy Writ, of any Spiritual vertue to accompany this Sacrament; so that, our Adversaries, whilst they are so eager to oppose the Reality, do, as much as in them lies, destroy the nature, and end of this Blessed Institution, and have no argument at all to use against the *Socinian*, who denies the Real Vertue, as well as the Real Presence of

of Christs Body, in the Sacrament: Which is the reason, why, I do sometimes term this Vertue, (which the Author, without ground conceives to be in this Ordinance, tho' separate from Christs Real Body) Imaginary; because there is no reason to conclude the vertue of the Body to be here, from Scripture, unless the Body be so too; not that I would derogate at all from the vertue of Christs Body, which by reason of the Hypostatical union is Infinite. But this task is already performed by a Learned Modern * Author: And the Reader may easily discern the Truth of what I have here asserted, by inspecting such places of Holy Scripture as relate to this Sacrament, into the number of which they will not allow the sixth Chapter of St. *Johns* Gospel to be admitted.

* M. *Arnaud* de la perpetuë de la foy. &c. Tom. 2.

Having therefore thus explained those places of Holy Scripture which relate to the Blessed Sacrament, as also those other Forms of speaking, both of Divine and Human Authority, which the Author is pleas'd to compare with the Words of our Lords Institution, and shew'd, upon comparing them together, that they will not at all fit his purpose, but prove the quite contrary to what he would have them to do: I shall now sum up such of the Reasons and Arguments for the understanding the Words, in which our Saviour Instituted this Blessed Sacrament, in a proper Sense (as the Catholic Church expounds them) as are plainly deduced from the Nature and End of this Holy Institution, and the Manner of expressing it in Holy Scripture (which I intreat the Christian Reader seriously to consider of) and so conclude this Head of Discourse.

1. Because Christ the great Lover of Souls never spake to his Apostles and Disciples in Figures and Parables which had any obscurity or difficult Sense, (especially, if the Discourse related to the Practice of a necessary Duty) with an intention to keep them in Ignorance; but * that their humble and well disposed minds might be the more excited and inflamed with a desire of inquiring into and understanding the true meaning of what he said, and that they might

Reasons from Scripture for the proper sense of the words of Institution.

* See Dr. *Hammond* in Matt. 13. 13.

Transubstantiation Defended.

might the better retain it: And because in all such cases, even of less difficulty than this of the Sacrament (as particularly in the Parable of the Sower of Seed, altho' the Mystery, concerning the success of the Gospel which was herein prefigured, was not necessary for every one to know, as that of the Eucharist was) Christ did fully explain himself to his Disciples, who were also to instruct others. Therefore since the words of the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament, if understood Figuratively, as the Protestants, and particularly the Author, would have them to be, must need be allow'd to be obscure and difficult, because they differ so much among themselves, as well as from the Catholic Church, about the meaning of them, and yet none of the Evangelists nor St. *Paul*, altho' varying in expressing the Words of Institution, have inserted any words which in the least explain the Sense to be Figurative or Parabolical; hence it follows, That the Church hath great reason to understand them properly.

2. Because now, just upon our Lords Passion, it was the Time for Figures and Shadows to vanish, and for Truth and Reality to appear; And our Lord was Instituting the Great Sacrament of Christian Religion, he could not therefore speak with too much force and efficacy, especially, since he now spake to his Apostles in private, to whom he was used, at such times, to speak very plainly.

3. Because Christ was making his Last Will and Testament, which was to be expressed in such plain and distinct Terms, that there might be no just reason for his Children to contend about their Legacy: And can we be so unworthy as to imagin, that in this his Last and Kindest Bequest, he left us no more but a Morsel of Common dry Bread to eat, and a little ordinary Wine and Water to drink, in remembrance of him; whereas a kind and good natur'd Man will leave his most precious Jewel to his dear Friend to remember him by, when he departs from him to take a long Journey and to make any considerable stay? A good Father when he is to dye, thinks all his best Goods and Possessions

essions too little to leave his Children. He was also delivering a Commandment to observe, which that it might be rightly executed, ought to be promulged in a manner very intelligible.

4. Our Lord was near his Death, and therefore it was a time to avoid Obscurity in Speech, since he was not to continue any longer amongst them to interpret it.

5. Our Saviour in the choice of these words had not only regard to the Apostles, but he likewise spake them to all the Church in all succeeding Ages, and knew certainly, when he pronounced them, how they would always construe them; and yet, for the confirmation of the Sense of the Reality, did never suffer it to be call'd in question so much as privately, for almost a Thousand Years, when also the whole Body of his Pastors who were endu'd with extraordinary Light and Assistance of his Holy Spirit, to enable them to interpret aright the Divine Mysteries, had already just before in (a) Three Councils agreed upon this Sense, as that which had been constantly receiv'd in the Church ever since our Saviours Time, and which was more explicitly (b) declared against that one (c) Dissenter who sometime after appear'd against it, but was ashamed of his Opinion and recanted.

(a) Viz. The Councils of Constantinople, the second General one at Nice, and that of Frankfort.

(b) In the Council of Rome under Gregory 7. &c.

(c) Berengarius.

Lastly, if we consider, as hath been now fully prov'd, That all the places of Holy Scripture, as also all other Forms of Human Discourse which are alledged by our Adversaries, as like to this of our Lords Institution, are wholly different from it, shewing them the quite contrary to what they pretend them for, and that our Saviour did neither before, at, or after the Institution any ways prepare or dispose his Disciples to understand these words in a Figurative Sense, it must needs be very evident to any Man that will impartially regard things, that because Christ ever spake reasonably, and in a manner conformable to good Sense, and his Power infinitely exceeds the capacity of our Minds; therefore there is *no Reason to understand those words of our Saviours, THIS IS MY BODY, and THIS IS MY BLOOD* in a Metaphorical Sense,

Conclusion of this Head of Discourse.

Transubstantiation Defended.

* See the Intro-
duction

as the Author and the Sacramentarians do, *but an evident necessity* to believe them in that proper Sense, which * necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation, as the Catholic Church doth, since Scripture interpreted by the Rules of Human Discourse, as also the Tradition and Authority of this Church oblige us so to do : The latter of which is to be the Subject of the Second Part of the Answer to *the Discourse against Transubstantiation.*

The

The Contents of the First Part of the Answer to the Discourse against Transubstantiation.

1. **I** *T* is shew'd that our Adversary doth not rightly state the Point. Page 1
2. What is meant by Transubstantiation. 4
3. The Argument from Sense shew'd to be Senseless. *ibid.*
4. The Catholic Faith is ridicul'd by the Adversary. 7
5. The Real Presence and Transubstantiation depends on Gods Veracity. 9
6. No-Transubstantiation an Article of Faith with our Adversaries, and establish'd with Penalties. 10
7. The Method of the ensuing Discourse. 11
8. The Necessity of understanding our Lords words in the Sense of the Real Presence or Transubstantiation. 13
9. The Sense of the Schoolmen corrupted, and their Problematical Discourse mistaken for their Conclusion by the Adversary. 16
10. The Disparity between the Figurative Expressions in Holy Scripture, and the words of Institution, This is my Body, shews that the Latter are to be taken properly. 25, &c.
11. Principles upon which the ensuing Discourse is grounded. *ibid.*
12. How Catholics interpret the words of Institution, and how Protestants. 26
13. In what Sense Catholics allow a Figure in the Sacrament. 28
14. Rules to judg of Metaphorical Expressions by. 31, 2.
15. The Application of the forgoing Rules : by which it appears, that those merely Metaphorical Expressions of our Saviors being a Door, a Vine, &c. are not at all like to the Form of Consecration, This is my Body. 33, &c.

16. A

The CONTENTS.

16. *A Metaphor conveys no Spiritual Vertue.* Page 36
17. *The Exposition of Pharaoh's Dream doth not resemble the Sacred words of Consecration, This is my Body.* *ibid.*
18. *Distinctions and Rules for the following Discourse of the Nature of Signs.* *ibid.*
19. *Application of the foregoing Rules and Distinctions.* 37
20. *The Analogy which the words of Institution, This is my Body, might have to the Paschal Form in Scripture, or to those Phrases cited from Esdras, or any of the Rabins, doth not prove that Christs words here, are taken Figuratively and not in a proper Sense.* 40
21. *A Deeds being call'd a Conveyance doth not prove that the words, This is my Body, are not to be taken properly.* 46
22. *Texts of Scripture examined, and prov'd not at all to favour the Sense of the Author of the Discourse against Transubstantiation.* 47
23. *Christ's Body being broken, and his Blood being poured out, for the Remission of Sins, before he was Crucified, proves the Sense of the Reality, or Transubstantiation.* 52.
24. *The 6th Chapter of S. John's Gospel interpreted as relating to the Blessed Sacrament.* 54, &c.
25. *The words, Do this in Remembrance of me, explain'd.* 59.
26. *The Real Vertue of Christs Body in the Sacrament cannot be prov'd from Scripture, unless the Real Presence of his Body it self be admitted.* 60
27. *Further Reasons from Scripture for the proper Sense of the words of Institution, which necessarily inferreth Transubstantiation.* 61
28. *The Conclusion of this Head of Discourse upon Scripture Authority for the Real Presence and Transubstantiation; and of the first Part of the Answer to the Discourse against Transubstantiation.* 63

F I N I S.

